Vol. XXXIII. JANUARY, 1956. No. 1

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS

ALMA COLLEGE
P
LIBRARY
AuCR
Alma, California

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

45397

V.33
1956

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance,* 15/-.

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Military Camp, Waiouru, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn — Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. J. O'Connor, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Dubbo, N.S.W.
Diocese of Bunbury—V. Rev. C. Cunningham, Dardanup, W.A.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Cathedral, Geraldton, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. D. G. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Adm., Wangaratta, V.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—Rt. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Albury, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes — Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.
Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 1
General Decree restoring the liturgical order of Holy Week—Papal letter to Archbishop Duhig on the occasion of his episcopal jubilee.

HUMAN NATURE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF THE SUPERNATURAL .. .. Rev. John P. Kenny, S.J. 11

ARCHDEACON JOHN McENCROE (1795-1868), IX,
Rev. Roger Wynne 22

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY .. .. Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D. 32
The Liturgy and Dogma.

MORAL THEOLOGY, Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 38
Communicatio in sacris—Condition for Bination.

CANON LAW .. Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, P.C., D.C.L. 48
Dissolution of marriage "in favorem fidei".

LITURGY .. .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 55
Some Notes on Votive Masses.

HOMILETICS .. .. Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 63
Sacrificial response to the mercies of God.

NOTES 70
Notes on Archbishop Reynolds (Rev. Dom Ximenes, O.S.B.)—Propiation in the sacrifice of Old Testament (Rev. William Dalton, S.J.).

BOOK REVIEWS 84
New Light on the Passion (O'Connell); Being and Becoming (Hawkins); The Meaning of Love (Johann); Jesus in His Time (Daniel-Rops); Corpus Christi (Mascall); Love and Violence; Saint Therese of Lisieux (Morton); The Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes (St. Gregory of Nyssa); Doubt in Canon Law (Viau); The Cessation of Delegated Power (De Witt); Conflict and Light (*Ed.* Bruno); Is the Priest at Home? (Tomelty).

SHORT NOTICES 21, 31

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Januarii, 1956.

Official Documents

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES

General Decree

restoring the liturgical Order of Holy Week

Our Holy Mother the Church has, from Apostolic times, attached to the yearly celebration of the great mysteries of redemption, namely, the Passion, Death and Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ, a singular importance. From the earliest days she has taken care to surround them with the greatest solemnity. Hence the ancient origin of the special Triduum of the crucifixion, burial and resurrection (S. Aug. ep. 55, 14), to which was soon added the solemn commemoration of the institution of the Holy Eucharist, and lastly the liturgical celebration, on the Sunday immediately preceding the Passion, of the triumphal entrance of the Messianic King into the Holy City. Thus arose a liturgical week, which, on account of the excellence of the mysteries celebrated, was called Holy, and was enriched with rites of great grandeur and piety.

These rites were at the beginning celebrated on the same days and at the same hours that the holy mysteries took place. Consequently, the institution of the Holy Eucharist on Thursday was commemorated at eventime with a solemn Mass *in Cena Domini;* on Friday the special liturgical action commemorating the Passion and Death took place in the afternoon; lastly in the late hours of Holy Saturday was begun the vigil, which on the following morning ended in the joy of the Resurrection.

In the Middle Age, however, the time of these liturgical actions, on account of the concurrence of various causes, began to be anticipated in such a way that, towards the end of the same Middle Age, all those liturgical solemnities had been pushed back to the morning hours, not without great loss to the sense of the liturgy, and not without a disharmony, which could not but be felt, between the evangelical narratives and the corresponding liturgical representations. In particular, the solemn liturgy of the Paschal Vigil, taken out of its proper nocturnal place, obviously lost its native clearness and the sense of its words and symbols. Besides, Holy Saturday, prematurely invaded by the joy of Easter, surrendered its proper character of mourning over the memory of Our Lord's burial.

At a later age a further change ensued, of which the consequences from a pastoral point of view were very serious. Whereas Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Holy Week had for centuries been numbered amongst feast days, with the view that the whole Christian people, being free from servile works, might frequent the ceremonies of those days, changed circumstances led in the 17th century to a diminution of the number of feast-days, so that, under the compulsion of the new conditions, Pope Urban VIII, by the Apostolic Constitution, "Universa per orbem", given on Sept. 24, 1642, took away that festive quality from the sacred Triduum of Holy Week and numbered the three days amongst ferial days.

From that time the frequentation of the sacred rites by the faithful necessarily declined, especially for the reason that the celebrations had been long since fixed on morning hours, when schools and public business were the routine everywhere on non-festal days. General and almost universal experience registers the fact that the liturgical actions of the Sacred Triduum are carried out by clerics only, with very few people in the body of the church.

This is highly regrettable, because the liturgical rites of Holy Week, being of singular dignity, and endowed with peculiar sacramental efficacy to nourish Christian life, cannot be adequately compensated by those pious exercises of devotion which are called extra-liturgical, and which are carried out during the Sacred Triduum in the afternoon hours.

For these reasons, liturgical experts, priests in the care of souls, and especially Bishops, have, in recent years, urgently requested the Holy See to restore those liturgical functions of the Sacred Triduum to their former place, in the afternoon and evening hours, so that all the faithful may find it more easy to attend them.

After mature consideration, the Supreme Pontiff Pius XII, in the year 1951, restored the liturgy of the Paschal Vigil, for the time being as the Bishops asked for it, and by way of experiment.

As this experiment, as reported by the Bishops of the world, proved very successful, and, as many local Ordinaries repeated their petitions, asking also that for the other days of Holy Week there should be a similar liturgical restoration, the sacred functions being replaced again in the evening hours—as, moreover, evening Masses, as allowed by the Apostolic Constitution "Christus Dominus" of January 6, 1953, have drawn great congregations everywhere, Our Most Holy Lord, Pope

Pius XII, in consideration of all these things, ordered the Commission appointed by him for the restoration of the liturgy to examine this particular question of the restoration of the Order of Holy Week, and set forth their conclusion. This being done, His Holiness referred the whole grave question to the final examination of the Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

Their Eminences, in an extraordinary meeting held on the 19th of July of the current year, in the Vatican, voted unanimously that the restored Order of Holy Week be approved and prescribed, if it pleases His Holiness.

A report of the proceedings having been made to the Holy Father by the undersigned Cardinal Prefect, the Pontiff graciously approved the decision of their Eminences.

Wherefore, by special mandate of the sovereign Pontiff, the Sacred Congregation of Rites decrees as follows:

I. Restored Order of Holy Week is prescribed.

1. Those who follow the Roman Rite are henceforth obliged to observe the restored Order of Holy Week, as described in the typical Vatican edition. Those who follow other Latin Rites are obliged only to observe the time of the liturgical celebrations set down in the new Order.

II. Hour of Celebration.

Divine Office 4. On Palm Sunday, and Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday of the Holy Week, the Divine Office is recited at the usual hours.

5. In the Sacred Triduum, Thursday in Cena Domini, Friday in Passione et Morte Domini, and Holy Saturday, if the Office is recited *in choir* or *in common,* the following are to be observed:

Matins and Lauds are not anticipated in the evening, but are said in the morning, at a suitable hour. In cathedrals, however, when the Mass of the Oils is celebrated on the morning of Holy Thursday, the Matins and Lauds of this Thursday can be anticipated on the evening before.

The Little Hours are said at a suitable time.

On Thursday and Friday, Vespers are omitted, since their place is taken by the principal liturgical functions of these days. On Holy Saturday, vespers are said in the afternoon, at the usual hour.

Compline of Thursday and Friday is said after the liturgical functions of the evening; on Holy Saturday it is omitted.

In private recitation, on these three days all the canonical hours must be said according to the rubrics.

Mass or the Principal Liturgical Action.

6. On the second Sunday of the Passion (Palm Sunday) the solemn blessing and procession of Palms take place in the morning, at the usual hour—in choir after Tierce.

7. On Thursday in Cena Domini the Mass of the Oils is celebrated after Tierce; the Mass in Cena Domini is celebrated at the most suitable evening hour, not however before five nor after eight.

On Friday in Passione et Morte Domini, the solemn liturgical action is celebrated in the afternoon, about 3 p.m.; should some pastoral reason suggest it, a later hour may be chosen, but not later than 6 p.m.

The solemn Paschal Vigil is celebrated at a suitable hour, an hour, namely, which will allow the Mass of the Vigil to begin about midnight between Holy Saturday and the Sunday of the Resurrection.

Where, however, in view of local conditions, the Ordinary judges an earlier hour better, the anticipation of the hour should not precede twilight or certainly not be before sunset.

III. Lenten abstinence and fast.

10. The abstinence and fast of Lent, which hitherto, in accordance with canon 1252 § 4, ceased at noon of Holy Saturday, henceforth ceases at midnight of Holy Saturday.

Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

Nov. 16, 1955.

C. Card. CICOGNANI, *Prefect.*
+ A. Carinci, Abp. Seleuc., *Secretary.*

* * * *

INSTRUCTION.

The purpose of the restored Order of Holy Week being that the venerable liturgy of those days may be more easily, devoutly and fruitfully frequented by the faithful, it is of the greatest importance that every care should be taken to reach this aim.

Hence, the Sacred Congregation of Rites has deemed it opportune to add the present Instruction, the knowledge and observance of which are enjoined on all concerned.

I. Pastoral and Ritual Preparation.

1. Local Ordinaries will see to it that priests, especially those charged with the care of souls, will carefully acquaint themselves not only with the ritual celebration of the restored Order, but also with its meaning and pastoral purpose.

Let them provide also that during Lent the faithful may be in-

structed, so that they will participate as fully as possible with mind and heart in the sacred functions.

2. The chief headings of such instruction will be:

a) *For the second Sunday of Passiontide.* Let the faithful be invited to make this Palm Sunday liturgy a public testimony of gratitude and love to Christ the King.

The faithful should come in good time to confession and have ample opportunity to receive the sacrament of Penance during Holy Week and especially during the Sacred Triduum—last moment flocking to confession should be controlled and regulated, where it has become a custom.

b) *For Thursday in Cena Domini.* Let the faithful be instructed about the love with which Christ, our Lord, "the day before He suffered", instituted the Holy Eucharist as a sacrifice and sacrament. and as a perpetual memorial of His Passion, to be celebrated by the hands of priests perennially.

The faithful should also be invited to follow up the Mass in Cena Domini by due adoration of the August Sacrament.

Where the washing of feet takes place. to show forth the Lord's command regarding fraternal charity, the faithful should be taught the profound significance of the rite, and also the lesson of abounding during that day in works of charity a lesson which they should draw from the rite.

c) *Friday in Passione et Morte Domini.* Let the faithful be disposed to understand the liturgical action of this day, its sacred readings and prayers, the solemn chanting of the Passion, the prayers for the needs of the whole church and of all mankind, the adoration of the Holy Cross as the trophy of our redemption. They should be well aware that the restored Order reintroduces the old custom according to which all who desire it and are duly prepared can approach Holy Communion, with the intention of obtaining greater fruits of redemption through the devout reception of the body of the Lord delivered unto death for all.

Let priests insistently inculcate on the faithful the observance, during this most sacred day, of pious recollection of mind; and let them not forget the law of abstinence and fast.

d) *For Holy Saturday and the Paschal Vigil.* It is of primary necessity that the faithful be instructed on the special liturgical character of Holy Saturday. It is a day of great mourning. The Church

stands at our Lord's sepulchre meditating His Passion and Death. She abstains from the sacrifice of the Mass, and keeps the altars stripped. This is the character of the day till, after the solemn vigil or nocturnal expectation of the Resurrection, the time of Paschal joys arrives, the abundance of which overflows into the days that follow.

The object and end of the vigil is to show forth liturgically and recall how life and grace came to us from the death of our Lord. Hence, under the symbol of the Paschal Candle our Lord is seen as "the Light of the world" (Jn. 8:12); the *Exultet* chants the splendour of the holy night of the Resurrection; the wonders of the Old Testament are recalled as pale images of the wonders of the New; the baptismal water is blessed, in which, "buried with Christ", for the death of sin, we rise together with the same Christ, that we may walk "in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4); then, in regard to this grace, which Christ has merited for us and has conferred in baptism, through the renewal of our baptismal promises, we pledge ourselves to testify it by our life and conduct before all men; lastly, when the intercession of the Church triumphant has been invoked the sacred Vigil terminates in the solemn Mass of the Resurrection.

3. The ritual preparation of the sacred ceremonies is no less necessary. Everything should be prepared and well arranged; all who take part, especially altar-boys, should be well instructed in what they must do.

II. Notes on some Rubrics.

a) 4. *For the whole of Holy Week.* Where a sufficient number of ministers is available, the sacred functions should be carried out with full ritual splendour. Otherwise, let the simple rite be used, with the observance of the particular rubrics, as noted in the respective places.

5. Wherever the note: "As in the Roman Breviary" occurs, all is to be taken from that book, according to the norms of the simplified rubrics.

6. Throughout the whole week, from Palm Sunday to the Mass of the Vigil inclusively, in the Mass solemnly celebrated (also in the solemn Good Friday function) all that the deacon, sub-deacon or lector chants or reads is omitted by the celebrant.

b) *Palm Sunday.* 7. In the blessing and procession of the Palms, branches of palm, olive or other trees are used. These branches,

according to local use, are either prepared by the faithful and brought to the church; or, after the blessing, are distributed to the faithful.

c) *Holy Thursday.* 8. For the solemn reposition of the Blessed Sacrament a suitable place is prepared in some chapel or altar of the church, as is prescribed in the Roman Missal, and is becomingly adorned with veils and lights.

9. In the preparation of this place the severity which accords with those days is recommended.

10. The adoration of the Holy Eucharist, beginning after the Mass in Cena Domini, should be continued till midnight at least. Then the memory of the Passion and Death follows upon the remembrance of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist.

d) *The Paschal Vigil.* 11. The signs to be incised in the Paschal Candle may be prepared beforehand in colours or otherwise.

12. The candles carried by the clergy and people it is fitting to keep alight during the Exultet and the renewal of the baptismal promises.

13. It is proper that the vessel holding the water to be blessed should be fittingly adorned.

14. If there are some infants or adults to be baptized, it is permitted to perform the ceremonies up to Credis? (for infants) and up to Quis vocaris? (for adults) on Holy Saturday morning.

15. If there is an ordination, the last admonition is put before, not after the Pontifical Blessing.

16. In the Vigil of Pentecost, with the omission of lections or prophecies, the blessing of baptismal water, and litanies, Mass, even if it be conventual, or solemn or chanted, begins in the usual way, after the confession at the foot of the altar, with the introit: "cum sanctificatus fuero".

III. Mass, Communion, Eucharistic Fast during Triduum.

17. On Holy Thursday private Masses are forbidden. All priests and clerics should be present and communicate at the Mass in Cena Domini.

Where pastoral reasons demand it, the Ordinary may permit one or two low Masses in each church or public oratory; in semi-public oratories, he may permit one Low Mass only—so as to allow all the faithful to attend Mass on that day and receive Holy Communion. These Masses, however, are permitted only within the hours mentioned above.

18. On Holy Thursday, Communion may be distributed only within the evening Masses or immediately after them; so also on Holy Saturday—excepting the sick or those in danger of death.

19. On Good Friday Communion may be distributed only within the solemn liturgical action—again excepting the sick and those in danger of death.

20. Priests who celebrate the Mass of the Paschal Vigil may celebrate the festive Mass of the Resurrection also, and, if they have an Indult, binate or trinate.

21. The Ordinary who celebrates the Mass of the Oils on Holy Thursday can also celebrate the evening solemn Mass in Cena Domini. If he celebrates the solemn Mass of the Paschal Vigil, he may, but is not obliged, to celebrate the solemn Mass of the Resurrection.

22. Regarding the Eucharistic Fast the norms of the Constitution "Christus Dominus" are to be observed.

IV. On some difficulties.

23. Popular devotions, if conducive to solid piety, should be arranged, so as not to disturb the liturgical functions, for these are altogether of superior value, and the faithful should be taught this.

24. The Blessing of houses customary in many places on Holy Saturday should, by arrangement of the Ordinary, be done at an opportune time, before or after the feast of Easter, the parish priest or his delegates using the opportunity to visit the people and inquire about their spiritual state (can. 462, n. 6).

25. The ringing of bells takes place at the Gloria of the solemn evening Mass of Holy Thursday, and at the Gloria of the solemn vigiliar Mass of Holy Saturday.

a) Where there is only one church, the bells are rung at the beginning of the Gloria in that church.

b) Where there are several churches, the cathedral or mother church, or the principal church rings at the Gloria, and all the others at the same time. In doubt as to which is the mother church or the principal church, let the Ordinary be consulted.

Nov. 16, 1955.

C. Card. Cicognani, *Prefect.*

+ A. Carinci, Abp. Seleuc., *Secretary.*

Note: In some places the translation of the Instruction is compendious, but nothing essential has been omitted.

* * * *

Papal Letter to Archbishop Duhig on the occasion of his Episcopal Jubilee.

Venerabilit Fratri
Jacobo Duhig
Archiepiscopo Brisbanensi
Nostro Solio Adstanti
PIUS PP. XII

Venerabilis Frater, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem—Raro admodum sacrorum Antistitibus contingit, ut quinquagesimum a suscepto episcopatu annum peragere queant. Jure igitur ac merito fideles tibi commissi, auspice quidem ac favente clero, flagranti studio contendunt, ut perjucundi istius eventus commemorationem, qui tibi fauste imminet, publicis venerationis gratique amoris declarationibus concorditer prosequantur. Praeclara sunt enim tua erga Ecclesiam proximorumque utilitatem merita, quae hoc diuturno aetatis spatio tibi Deo juvante comparasti. In ipsa profecto florente aetate episcopali adauctus honore antea in dioecesi Rockhamptonensi per septennium, deinde vero in metropolitana ista sede pastorali ministerio operam adsiduam sollertemque impendisti. Te quidem fautore ac moderatore tot sacrae aedes, tot scholae catholicae et alia educationis vel caritatis instituta condita sunt, tot extant in tua dicione familiae religiosae, plures domus infantibus aut senibus curandis tuendisque aedificatae sunt, omnes civiles humanaeque artes studiose efficaciterque promotae. Quapropter tibi, Venerabilis Frater, de pastorali munere tam diuturne fructuoseque gesto magnopere gratulamur, simulque Deum instanter precamur, ut copiosis donis solaciisque te liberaliter exornare velit. Quo interea laetissimi eventus celebratio salutarior gregi tuo evadat, tibi ultro potestatem largimur, ut, die statuta, Sacro pontificali ritu peracto, adstantibus fidelibus Nostro nomine Nostraque auctoritate benedicas, plenariam indulgentiam iisdem proponens, usitatis Ecclesiae condicionibus lucrandam. Supernae demum opis ac praesidii in auspicium atque in peculiaris Nostrae dilectionis pignus Apostolicam Benedictionem tibi, Venerabilis frater, cunctoque clero ac populo tuae curae tradito peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die XII mensis Octobris, anno MDCCCCLV, Pontificatus Nostri septimo decimo.

PIUS PP. XII.

* * * *

Translation

To Our Venerable Brother, James Duhig, Assistant at Our Papal Throne

PIUS XII POPE

Venerable Brother, Health and Apostolic Benediction—

Rarely indeed does it happen that a Bishop reaches the fiftieth anniversary of his consecration. It is therefore most fitting that the faithful entrusted to your care, acting with the full favour of the clergy and under their auspices, should enthusiastically combine all their efforts, in order to mark, with united public manifestations of their veneration and grateful love, the commemoration of this happy event, which is now so near.

The Jubilee celebrations will recall the outstanding works with which by the help of God you have deserved so well of the Church and so greatly benefited your fellow men throughout the long space of those fifty years. Raised to the episcopal dignity in the flower of your youthful vigour, you dedicated yourself to the pastoral ministry, first for seven years in the Diocese of Rockhampton, then in the Metropolitan See of Brisbane, labouring with the most assiduous and vigilant devotedness in the care of souls. Under the enterprising inspiration and direction of Your Grace very many churches, very many Catholic schools and other institutions of education and charity have been founded; very many Religious Families flourish in your Archdiocese, several homes for the care of children and the aged have been built, all the arts of civil life and culture have been constantly and efficaciously promoted. Accordingly, We heartily congratulate you, Venerable Brother, on such a long and fruitful exercise of the pastoral office, and, at the same time, We fervently pray to God, that He may enrich you in generous measure with the lavish bounty of His gifts and consolations. Meanwhile, with a view to making the celebration of this most joyful event of greater advantage to your flock, We willingly grant that, on an appointed day, at the close of Pontifical Mass, you may, in Our name and with Our authority, bless the faithful present, granting them a plenary indulgence, to be gained on the usual conditions laid down by the Church.

Finally, as a pledge of divine help and protection, and in testimony of Our special love for you, with deep affection in the Lord, We impart the Apostolic Blessing to you, Venerable Brother, and to all the clergy and people entrusted to your care.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, the twelfth day of October, 1955, the seventeenth year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS XII, POPE.

W. LEONARD.

Human Nature under the influence of the Supernatural

Summary: 1. What is Human Nature (a) The concept of specific human nature; (b) the concept of individual human nature. 2. Human Nature as *open* towards the Supernatural: (a) Material, infra-personal beings contrasted with spiritual natures; (b) obediential potency in human nature.

Over this vast and thorny problem of human nature and its relations to the supernatural, oceans of ink have been spilt. In recent years nothing has so fascinated theologians as the riddle of the supernatural. There is, then, no need to apologise for the following pages. In them I have simply singled out two facets of the problem that attract me, facets that are not always sufficiently attended to. Nevertheless, they have important bearings on the problem.

(1) WHAT IS HUMAN NATURE?

In coming to grips with the relation between human nature and the supernatural, the first thing to do is to ask what human nature is. Human nature can be used in various senses. Only two are relevant to our problem: (a) *Human nature* in its specific or "quidditative" sense; (b) *human nature* in its "individual", concrete sense. Let us look at each in turn.

(a) THE CONCEPT OF *SPECIFIC* HUMAN NATURE.

There is little difficulty about fashioning for oneself a concept of specific human nature. It is an abstract concept, and represents the ontological human type, communicable to many; the sheaf of essential perfections, not taking into account the individuals in whom they are realised.[1]

The only point that is important for us is the intellect's competence to shape this concept of man's abstract essence. That may seem to the reader so obvious as not to need any express mention. Yet it needs to be emphasised—for, at least by implication, it is threatened by the stand of some modern theologians.

Discussing the gratuity of the supernatural, certain modern thinkers have argued that it is quite useless to invoke the theory of "pure" nature.[2] In order to demonstrate the gratuity of the supernatural, the

[1] Cf. *de Broglie*, "De fine ultimo humanae vitae", Paris, 1948, pp. 126-128.

[2] Fr. de Broglie, op. cit., deals excellently with: (i) The special gratuity of the supernatural, pp. 154-162; (ii) the question of "pure" nature, disentangling it from the immensely important *dogmatic* (not merely "theological" or "systematic") question of the possibility of man's non-vocation to the Beatific Vision. Cf. also *I. F. Sagüés*, "De Deo creante et elevante", B.A.C., Madrid, 1952.

common procedure has been to appeal to a hypothetical state of pure nature. In this hypothetical state, one would have a perfectly equipped human nature, without, however, any supernatural influence or end. One could thus show that the supernatural is quite outside and beyond the reach of human nature as such.

Now, this common procedure, as I mentioned, has been challenged by some modern theologians on the grounds of its uselessness and that it defeats its own end. "What you have to prove", they say, "is that the supernatural is gratuitous to my concrete human nature—not just to some chimerical human nature that never did, and never will, exist. The supernatural is gratuitous to me, to my here-and-now 'ego'. But my 'ego', as I know it now, cannot possibly be the same as that postulated 'ego' in a state of pure nature, where it would exist without the slightest trace or colouring of the supernatural. Those two 'egos' would be poles apart". "You may well succeed", they continue, "in showing the gratuity of the supernatural towards that 'ego' of yours dreamt of as being in the phantom state of pure nature; but you have not even begun to touch the burning question: 'In what sense is the supernatural gratuitous towards your "ego" as it exists here and now, in an order that is factually supernatural?' "[3]

This interesting argument fails to do justice to the abstractive power of the intellect, to its ability to fashion for itself one single concept of human nature, an abstract or skeletal concept that must be valid for human nature wherever it is found. Everywhere, whether in a natural or in a supernatural sphere, human nature must be substantially the same. *Specific* human nature—that is what the abstract concept presents us with.

The truth to be clung to "mordicus" is this: No matter how deeply the supernatural shoots its roots into me, even though I should find it inscribed in the very structure of my being, still human nature must remain substantially the same—everywhere, whether shorn of the influence of the supernatural or not.

The assignment to human nature of a supernatural, instead of a natural, destiny cannot substantially alter human nature. It may affect it profoundly. Indeed, necessarily it will affect it profoundly. It will change, it will elevate nature; it will shed its radiance through and through nature; it will have ontological repercussions in nature; according to many, it will also give a new tone and colour to man's very

[3]Cf. "Le Mystère du Surnaturel", *Recherhes de Science Religieuse*, 1949, pp. 80-121, especially p. 93.

psychology. Yet it leaves human nature substantially the same. Whatever change is wrought cannot be more than accidental.

The trouble is, we all too readily forget that *accidents* can have vast and far-reaching effects on substances, piercing down (if I may say so) to their very marrow. Nevertheless, accidents do not, and cannot, change substances substantially.

An example will make this clear. Take sex in men and women. Its influence is deep. Between men and women sex implies not only obvious physical, structural differences, not only quite distinctive physiological characteristics, but also emotional reactions and a whole psychology coloured by, grounded in, the different organic features of the two sexes. Nevertheless, though the differences between men and women are deep-rooted, intrinsic and wide in their manifestations, men and women are substantially the same in their possession of human nature. Human nature is predicted of both indifferently. In last analysis, the changes wrought by sex are not substantial, but only accidental.

So with man considered in his present supernatural order and in a state of pure nature. In the first case, the influence of the supernatural might be such as could not be exaggerated. Yet the abstract concept that the intellect forms of human nature would apply to man in both states. To deny this would be to jeopardise the abstractive power of the intellect. Since the intellect's competence in this field must be regarded as beyond cavil, any contention threatening it must be ruled out of court at once.

(b) THE CONCEPT OF *INDIVIDUAL* HUMAN NATURE.

While there is not much difficulty about forming an abstract concept of human nature, it is quite a different matter to gain an *adequate* concept of existing human nature.[4] Yet it is here that the problem of the supernatural becomes acute. Hence we must pause to investigate this point.

Why is it hard to get an adequate concept of concrete human nature?

In general, I must fashion my knowledge of concrete natures

---

[4]Fr. de Broglie, op. cit., p. 128, points out how St. Thomas speaks of individual human nature and how a whole Tract of Theology deals with the "natura humana INDIVIDUA Christi". Père *du Manoir*, discussing Cyril of Alexandria's Christological teaching has often to draw attention to the difference between "la nature humaine en général" and "une nature concrète et individualiseée": "Dogme et spiritualité chez saint Cyrille d' Alexandrie", Paris, 1944, pp. 126, 129, 263, 320, etc.

from two sources. First, I draw on sensation. My senses furnish me with some knowledge about the outward garment of things, about their appearances, their behaviour. Secondly, I bring my intellect into play. It enables me to pierce down to the metaphysical "marrow" of things so that I can know them as "beings". I blend together the yieldings from these two sources of knowledge. From that blending I finally get my rough and ready concept of individual realities. Such a concept of concrete natures the Greek philosophers had; so, too, the Medievals. The question that interests us is: Was that concept adequate?

Reasons exist for doubting its adequacy. For concrete reality has a history. That history is not easily unravelled. The Greeks did not know that history. Mostly it was unknown to the Medievals also. Nevertheless, that history may be decisive for the question of an *adequate,* against an *inadequate,* concept of concrete natures. For that history is most revealing about the nature of things. It tells one much about a concrete thing's capacities and variability; much about an existing nature's manifold virtualities and elasticity. All these pieces of knowledge fill out the adequate concept of the concrete nature of things.

Modern science has yielded an abundant harvest of information about the history of many material substances. To-day we know about the disintegration of radio-active substances. The Greeks and the Medievals had none of this knowledge. Yet, plainly, such knowledge puts us in a better position, than they were in, to grasp adequately the concrete nature of radio-active substances. However, even our 1955 knowledge is incomplete. One reason for this is the simple one that those histories are still running on; another is because in many fields modern science is still only groping.

At this stage the reader may voice an objection: "Yes, I admit all you say about *material substances.* Past knowledge of them was defective. That means that the concepts had of such concrete substances were also limping. However, things are quite different when it comes to knowing man himself—the only case that concerns us here. Our knowledge of man is vastly superior to our knowledge of material things. For we can draw on the rich witness of self-experience. Man knows himself for what he is and affirms himself in his most characteristic acts. Hence, there can be no serious difficulty about forming an adequate concept of concrete *human* nature".

Of course it is true that our concept of man's individual nature is more complete than our concept of the natures of other things. Yet man also has a history. To arrive at a perfectly adequate concept of his concrete reality, that history must be taken into account. Adequately to understand concrete man, some knowledge of his history is plainly indispensable. That alone can illustrate the forces and resilience and capacities of his concrete nature.

However it is precisely at this stage that we are halted by a barrier peculiar to the knowledge of man. There is not just the difficulty that the last page of human history has not yet been penned. That lack may not be decisive. The difficulty is rather this: Man's whole history has been staged in a *supernatural* order.

What is the significance of this statement? It means that man has lived in a supernatural order, not only since Christ Our Lord walked this earth and founded His Church, but always, from the very start, and everywhere. Clearly, the Christian lives in a supernatural world, the world of the Mystical Body, the Church, with its divine guidance, its imperishable teaching, its magnificent channels of grace and holiness. But both outside the pale of Catholicism and even before the Church was launched on the world, the whole of man's life, the life of every single man, has been led in a supernatural order. All men have been called to the Beatific Vision. Not only called—all have been commanded to tend towards this Vision. Everywhere grace is at work, has been at work. Of course, all grace is Christ's grace, the Church's grace. No grace has ever come to men except because of Christ and His merits. Nevertheless, grace has been coming to men who have never heard of Christ's name; and it has come to men who existed thousands of years before the Word took flesh and dwelt amongst us. Indeed, Christ is the true light, who enlightens *every man* that comes into the world. (Cf. John 1-9.)

The significance of all this for the adequate concept of man's concrete nature is not hard to discern. Throughout the perhaps 600,000 years of man's sojourn on this earth, the supernatural has, as it were, lapped man round; even been in and through man.[5] The Beatific Vision has been his sole appointed destiny. Grace has been offered to him, has been at work in him. This working of grace in

---

[5]See the discussion on this subject in *Theological Studies*, June, 1953, pp. 280-287.

man cannot but have awakened momentous echoes and reverberations in human history.[6]

When, therefore, man takes stock of himself he is knowing a being who is not simply "unadulterated" human nature. Many men may perhaps flatter themselves they can know themselves through and through just by the light of unaided reason. They pile together the data of reason and history, sensation and self-consciousness. The product, they imagine, is an adequate concept of their individual human nature. They little realise that that self they are studying is perhaps partly supernaturalised. When man is examining himself he is studying a being who has never breathed except in a supernatural atmosphere, and who has constantly been under the direct or indirect influence of the supernatural. But by the light of unaided reason he can know the supernatural only materially, not formally. Only with the help of public revelation can he know the supernatural as supernatural, and mark it off from the purely natural.

To put the matter another way. Drawing on abstract principles, on sensory evidence, on history, on the witness of consciousness, man may, indeed, form an adequate concept of his existing nature. But is that a concept of nature as contrasted with the supernatural? Without the addition of Revelation's light, is it possible for man to discern in him those factors and influence that are supernatural from those that

---

[6]This statement will be assented to by all. Above all, it will be underlined by those theologians who maintain that the supernatural gifts involve not merely an *ontological* elevation of man's nature (what all must admit) but also a *psychological* change. Supernatural faith and grace give man the *attitude of a son,* not just that of a slave. Such the thesis of such theologians as the following: Gregory de Valentia, S. Robert Bellarmine, Suarez, Cano, Banez, John of St. Thomas, the Carmelites of Salamanca, Mazella, Mattiussi, Scheeben, Garrigou-Lagrange, de la Taille, de Broglie, Boyer, Dhanis, Vignon, etc.

Cf. *H. Vignon,* "De virtutibus infusis", Rome, 1943, pp. 24-70. Of course, whilst holy people *before* Christ certainly possessed the grace-gifts, they did not have fully that *mind of Christ* or that *outlook of sons* that came in its fulness with Christianity. That is obvious from what St. Paul says in the opening verses of chapter 4 of the *Galatians.* It is obvious from what he says in chapter 8, verses 14-18 of the *Romans.* Hence, Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical on the Holy Ghost (*Divinum Illud*) writes of the just before Christ: ". . . . si et illi in fillis Dei numerabantur, conditione tamen perinde erant ac servi . . ." So Professor *Karl Rahner,* in an important article contributed to the Dutch review, *Bijdragen* (*"Theos im Neuen Testament"*, 1950, pp. 212-236, and 1951, pp. 24-51, especially p. 28 ff.), shows that the Old Testament represents God's generous personal dealings with men under the FIGURE of *fatherly* love; but all the time the men of the Old Testament thought of a Creator dealing with his servant.

However, if never before Christ men attained that fully awakened *consciousness* of divine adoptive sonship that is had as the privilege of the New Law, nevertheless the grace-gifts did exercise in them some psychological resonance. They were given a mind in harmony with God, at home with God, an outlook of faith and trust. . . .

are severely natural? Once he investigates himself in the radiance of God's Revelation, then he can nicely contrast the natural in him against the supernatural. But if he can achieve this contrast only with the aid of Revelation, then a perfectly adequate concept of individual human nature, of "unalloyed" human nature, is not feasible to the mere philosopher. For this concept of "unalloyed" human nature is a sort of residue-concept.[7] It is got only after a man has, in the light of Revelation, set to one side, sloughed off, as it were, those elements in him that are of supernatural provenance.

Thus the phrase, *"concrete human nature"*, can bear two senses. First, it may refer to that concept man fashions of his individual nature by the aid of sense, intellect, history, self-consciousness. But such a concept does not give human nature in its "pure" state; for such concrete human nature is always under the influence of the supernatural.

The second sense of the phrase refers to the "residue-concept" of human nature. It is gained only with the help of Dogmatic Theology. Because of what God has formally told man about the supernatural man is now equipped to distinguish in himself the natural from the supernatural. By leaving to one side those elements which he now recognises as supernatural, he is left with an adequate concept of individual human nature, human nature in its precise contrast with the supernatural, "pure", "unadulterated" concrete human nature.

(2) HUMAN NATURE AS OPEN TOWARDS THE SUPERNATURAL.

Man stands in a position of splendid isolation against his visible world and all the creatures that people it. For the visible world and the throngs of creatures that dwell in it are all material beings. Man is not just a material being. He is also spiritual; he is personal. The qualification of man as a spiritual, personal being is crucial in the problem of nature and the supernatural.

All infra-personal, material natures are limited on every hand. They are thoroughly cribbed, cabined, confined. Not only by origin and in their sheer concrete existence (in their "esse") are they finite and hedged in. But also their activities (their "agere"), even the loftiest, are essentially bounded and finite. All infra-personal beings, no matter how noble, have faculties that are shackled by a transcendental relation to what is merely finite and limited. Those of them that rank

---

[7] Professor Karl *Rahner* would call it: "ein Restbegriff". In the whole of this article I have been inspired by Fr. Rahner's ideas. See *"Schriften zur Theologie"*, Einsiedeln, 1954, pp. 322-345. Also: *"De gratia Christi"*, codex, Innsbruck, 1952, pp. 104-112.

highest in the scale of material existence have, indeed, intentional faculties or apparatus for knowledge; hence, to some extent, they can get outside themselves; they can know and desire other things. But the objects of their knowledge and desires are, like themselves, essentially finite. It is an iron law of material existence: No infra-personal being can break through the circle of its finitude, which hems in and encloses its whole being and all its manifold activities.

Sharply contrasted against material, infra-personal natures is man's spiritual, personal nature. It is true that in many ways man is bounded like material beings — he too is partly material. He is finite in his origin: even his imperishable soul began in time; he is finite in his being; he is finite through his body with its cluster of ties to time and space. His intentional faculties and activities, in so far as they are dependent on his sensory equipment, are finite too. But, although man is finite in his "terminus a quo", he is not finite in his "terminus ad quem". His most lofty and characteristic faculties throw wide for him the doors to the infinite. Through his spiritual faculties he is "capax infiniti", and can, consequently, become "quodammodo omnia". He has "immortal longings" in him. By means of his intellect and will man can reach after the infinite. His being is stamped with a boundless dynamism. Behind him the barriers are closed in; ahead they are cast down. He enjoys the priceless prerogatives of all spiritual, personal beings.

Whatever be the precise definition of the supernatural, no one will quarrel with us if we assert that it means some special, loving union with God himself, with the infinite himself. Hence no material, infra-personal being can be open towards the supernatural. In no sense whatsoever are infra-personal beings endowed with any potency for the supernatural. Just because they are so thoroughly circumscribed in every direction, they cannot be united with the infinite personally, they cannot enjoy even an obediential potency for the supernatural. The supernatural is said to perfect nature. Nature here must not be understood of material, infra-personal nature. Far from being able to perfect material beings, the supernatural would rive them asunder and destroy them.

But *human* nature, with its boundless dynamism, with its inborn openness towards the Infinite, is in potency, obediential potency, for the supernatural, for a union with the infinite God himself.

That human nature is in some sort of potency towards the supernatural can be gleaned from what has already been said about

man's nature as spiritual and personal. It is, further, a necessary deduction from something we know with the sovereign certitude of faith: to wit, that the supernatural does in fact affect, determine, elevate created human nature. Granted that the supernatural does impinge upon, change, sublimate our nature, then our nature must have some sort of potency to be so acted upon.

However, this potency that human nature has towards supernatural perfecting is only obediental. If Revelation teaches us to deduce the existence of this potency, it also, equally firmly, teaches us to infer that this potency cannot rise above the level of the obediential. For Revelation repeats again and again that our human nature can lodge absolutely no positive claim of any sort for the supernatural. From the resources of its own body the spider can spin its web. In no such wise can human nature manufacture the supernatural. Human nature possesses no resources from which it can produce the supernatural, from which it can produce even a binding title to the supernatural. To no created nature can the supernatural come except as an utterly gratuitous gift of God's sovereign munificence. But because man's nature is personal and spiritual, he is capable of receiving such a gift. Such a gift will not violate or undermine his nature, but rather it will ineffably perfect it. In other words, human nature has an obediential potency for the supernatural.

What is an obediential potency?[8] It is easier to say what it is not than what it is.

First, then, an obediential potency is not something purely negative. It is not a bare non-repugnance of notes. It is not just a figment of the mind, an airy and insubstantial "ens rationis". It is not simply—"vox et praeterea nihil".

On the other hand, an obediential potency must not be conceived too positively—or, better, as too positively distinct from the spiritual nature, an appendage to human nature. Nor is it to be confused with the ordinary exigent potencies—active or passive—that belong to human nature. For these manifold active and passive potencies DEMAND their connatural fulfilment. In no sense does the obediential potency *demand* the supernatural.

It is worth repeating that the obediential potency must never be confused with ordinary exigent potencies. Such a confusion is at work wherever it is affirmed that the more perfect an act is as natural "eo

---

[8]Cf. *Theological Studies*, 1953, p. 286, note 9.

ipso" the more perfect it will be as supernatural—granted, of course, the supernatural elevation. The falsehood of this assertion is evinced in the case of Christ Our Lord. His human acts, considered in their natural reality, are specifically below the "natural" acts of an angel. Yet his acts, as elevated, are almost infinitely higher than the supernatural acts of an angel. The degree of supernatural life conferred on man bears no proportion to, is in no sense a function of, the degree of natural disposition in human nature.

We have tried to sketch out what the obediential potency is not. What in fact is it? The obediential potency of human nature consists precisely in that spiritual, personal nature as such. An obediential potency enjoys all the dynamic reality of the nature as spiritual and as "open" to the Infinite God in himself. The obediential potency is such a spiritual, personal nature in so far as its real notes are not repugnant to the notes of the supernatural. An obediential potency means that certain, well-defined natures can be the subjects in which the supernatural can lodge itself, can be the seats of the supernatural.

One can understand, then, the assertion that human nature has an obediential potency for the supernatural. Human nature throws up no barrier to the conferring of supernatural life; on the contrary, human nature is so constructed as to give a welcome to the supernatural. Hence the supernatural can perfect human nature, and eminently so. However, the potency of human nature towards the supernatural is only obediential. Therefore, the perfections received do not fall within the ambit of those perfection on which human nature can lay claim. Though man is "open" to the supernatural, still it remains beyond the ken and the grasp of his native forces; he cannot claim it as his "ripe revenue and due by birth".

Relevant here is the Scholastic apothegm: "gratia perficit naturam". Assuredly the supernatural perfects human nature; it is the fine flower of that nature. While elevating nature to giddy heights, the supernatural exploits the resources of nature and leads them to all-rounded fruition. However, in this perfecting of nature by the supernatural, a distinction needs to be drawn between man "in via" and man "in patria".[9]

---

[9]The Roman Breviary for 29th July, Feast of St. Martha, in the 3rd Nocturn, cites St. Augustine: "Tendimus autem adhuc peregrinantes, nondum manentes; adhuc in via, nondum in patria; adhuc desiderando, nondum fruendo. Tamen tendamus, et sine pigritia et sine intermissione tendamus, ut aliquando pervenire valeamus".

Cf. 2 Cor. 5/1-6.

IN VIA, the supernatural may well seem to be hindrance rather than help to nature, encumbrance rather than perfection. For human nature has an inborn drive to perfect itself in every direction, to unfold itself to the uttermost, to pour itself out in the line of every natural tendency. But grace "in via" is always the grace of Christ *crucified*. It spells war to the death on many natural tendencies, and on all tendencies in so far as they become exorbitant. Here on earth, the man who would be thoroughly supernatural must be a man crucified to the world and to whom the world is crucified. Daily he must deny himself, take up his cross, seek, not to save his life, but to lose it. No adult can have in himself the grace of Christ, unless he shares somehow in the Passion and Cross of Christ Our Lord. Hence, there is a sense in which the supernatural does not perfect man, whilst he is a "viator".

But "in patria" the supernatural will fully penetrate man, and man will fully seize on the supernatural. In Heaven the supernatural will necessarily and in every sense perfect human nature, and to the uttermost. No longer will man experience any conflict or dualism within himself, but the supernatural will then mean the satisfaction of man's whole nature, the fullest unfolding of every natural potency. "IN PATRIA" so completely will the supernatural perfect human nature that it will not even seem to be in any sense destructive.

J. P. KENNY, S.J.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

"I MYSELF WILL COMFORT YOU": Helpful Thoughts for the Sorrowing. Compiled by An Ursuline Nun. 76 pp. Gill & Son, Dublin. 1953.

This booklet should receive a warm welcome from many busy people, especially those living in the world, where leisure is not easily come by. Its appeal should not be restricted by stressing "the sorrowing" mentioned in the sub-title. Many of the short poems and extracts from the writings of the saints are neat little capsules of wisdom to steady one even in the headiness of worldliness. There is even place for the Arabian proverb: "I had no shoes and I complained until I saw a man who had no feet."

Many of the most telling pages are anonymous, but none the worse for that as we may see from the following advice: "If tempted, say: *Jesus, mercy! Mary, help!* Then get up and do something to take your mind off the temptation. Activity banishes temptations—polish your shoes, the window panes, the grate—anything! . . . Above all, don't brood over your temptation; don't try to find out what gave rise to it . . . "

Then, there are some beautiful passages from St. Francis de Sales. Such pages are its recommendation as a good bed-side book, something on the same lines as *Leaflets,* that once enjoyed a well-deserved popularity.

M.O.

Archdeacon John McEncroe, IX
(1795-1868)

Summary: Background to Fr. McEncroe's visit to Europe—Vicissitudes of the *Freeman's Journal*—J. K. Heydon takes over control of the paper and is assisted by W. A. Duncan—New policy of 'open discussion' displeases Archbishop—Fr. McEncroe 'blamed' for countenancing certain articles—Ordered by Cardinal Barnabo to dispose of his interests in the journal—New light on Fr. McEncroe's commission to secure a Rector and staff for St. John's College—Brief record of his five week's stay in Rome—Some remarkable results of his mission.

In 1858, some eighteen months after the events narrated in our last chapter, when the clergy were convened by the Archbishop at Campbelltown to deliberate on measures that might be adopted to promote the interests of religion, "Father McEncroe represented the opinions of the great body of the assembled priests, when he suggested, as the one great remedy for which all hearts yearned, that new Dioceses be formed, and Irish bishops be appointed to them" (Moran, p. 142). When, therefore, in November of that same year the devoted priest left hurriedly for Europe there was little doubt in the minds of priests and people as to some at least of the objects of his mission. "Great things are expected here," wrote John O'Sullivan from Goulburn, "from the visit of the Archdeacon to Rome. Father McAlroy says we are to have a big increase in the number of our priests and teachers". How right Father McAlroy was soon became apparent when Goulburn received not only its quota of new priests and teachers but a brand new bishop as well. But what even the usually well informed J. O'S. did not seem to know what that there was another, more urgent and personal, reason for the good priest's hurried departure, namely to clear up some misconceptions at Rome concerning his responsibility for what was coming to be spoken of more and more in the correspondence of Dr. Polding as "that heretical and schismatical *Freeman*".

Just on a hundred years ago, when the tragic fate of Lamennais was still fresh in men's minds and the English hierarchy was worrying over Newman's association with *The Rambler*, it is quite understandable that ecclesiastical authority in N.S.W. was perhaps oversensitive to criticism even of a constructive kind. Certain it is, at any rate, that prior to 1858, that is while Father McEncroe had control of it, the *Freeman* published absolutely nothing deserving of condemnation as 'heretical' or 'schismatical'. Indiscretions there undoubtedly had been, but such as flow from inexperience rather than from malice. One such

indiscretion, during the editorship of Michael D'Arcy (Fr. McEncroe's cousin), had almost proved fatal, resulting as it did in an action for libel and in the seizure and removal of the entire printing press. Powerful friends eventually saved the situation, but the experience had undoubtedly a good deal to do with Father McEncroe's subsequent decision to transfer "the management as well as the legal control of the paper" to the new editor, Mr. Heydon. Who, you may ask, was Mr. Heydon?

On page 115 of his Autobiography, Dr. Ullathorne tells the amusing story of the poor old gardener at St. Mary's, who in order to quench his terrible thirst on a blazing hot summer's day, regretfully made up his mind to pawn the bishop's mitre at a Sydney store, and how the storekeeper, shrewdly guessing what it was and whence it came, had it restored to its rightful owner. Here endeth the story according to the Rt. Rev. Dr., and now legend takes over and adds a very interesting sequel, or rather a chain of sequels. According to the legend, for the truth of which we are unable to vouch, the owner of the store, a young Scotsman lately come from Glasgow, with the rather unusual name of Jabez King Heydon, decided to take back personally the precious head-dress to the cathedral, little dreaming that in so doing he was taking the first unconscious steps on the road to his own conversion. Verisimilitude, it must be admitted, is given to the legend by the known facts of Mr. Heydon's life. We know, for example, that on his arrival from Glasgow in 1838 he did establish a sort of pharmaceutical store in King St., and that very early in his Australian career he abandoned his Independent (or Congregationalist) views on religion and became not only a devout convert but a real Catholic Actionist. To Father McEncroe he seems to have been particularly devoted, actively participating with him in the many great social and political movements of which we have already spoken. From the commencement of the *Freeman,* his name appeared week by week as its manager and principal distributor. Unfortunately for the Peace of Jerusalem, however, his efforts to assist the *Freeman* were not confined to the distribution of copies and the collecting of fees; he frequently took a hand with the writing and the result, as we shall see, was not exactly to enhance the popularity of Father McEncroe's paper with the Archbishop and his autocratic Vicar-General. The trouble with J.K.H. seemed to be that the convert in him kept continually breaking out. Like his English counterparts of the Oxford Movement, he had no patience with the

slow easy-going methods of the old Catholics. He looked round about him in the diocese and found everywhere, or at least he said he found, vast numbers of Catholics without priests or sacraments; he examined the latest Official Report on the Schools of the Colony and found his worst fears realized. "In the Roman Catholic Schools", stated the Report, "the teachers were quite unfit and wholly incompetent; the children in a deplorable state of ignorance".

Free at last of the restraining influence of Father McEncroe, the over-zealous and somewhat impetuous convert proceeded to give full rein to his long pent up feelings. All that he had written heretofore became as milk and water compared with the really strong criticism that now began to issue forth in articles and editorials, and of which the following few sentences will serve as sufficient illustration: "If our orphan schools exhibit none of these peculiar traits which evince the tenderness of the Catholic Church for the little ones of Christ's poor, no doubt it is because, though we had the opportunity we have not enlisted in our behalf the sweet influence of the St. Vincent de Paul Society. If our schools have in so many instances been left in the charge of schoolmasters who are only such because they can find no other employment, no doubt it is because we have rejected the services of the Christian Brothers. If so many good priests, including the present illustrious Bishop of Birmingham, have left our shores to bestow the blessings with which they are charged upon other lands...if the See of Maitland remains so long vacant—no doubt the fault lies with ourselves; and as we cannot alter the past, the best we can do is to repent and amend".

Provocative as this type of editorial undoubtedly was, it was only with the entry into the fray of a new and more experienced collaborator, styling himself *Isidore,* that things began to liven up in real earnest. The new writer, it soon leaked out, was none other than our old friend of the *Australasian Chronicle,* Mr. W. A. Duncan, like Mr. Heydon, a Scotsman and a convert. Recently returned from Brisbane, where for some years since we last met him he had been Dean Rigney's right hand man in building up the Church in what was about to become the northern capital, he was obviously just the man to get J. K. Heydon's new venture off to a flying start. When Duncan died thirty years afterwards, a beautiful stained-glass window was dedicated to his memory by Cardinal Moran in St. Mary's Cathedral, and there were very few who would have said that the honour was not well deserved. But in 1858 and '59 his collaboration with Heydon not only did not receive

the applause or the approval of the Cardinal's predecessor, but actually brought the pair of them to the verge of excommunication. Let us glance briefly at his opening sentence: "The indifferent state of our Orphan Institution; the absence of religious cultivation in our leading Catholic youth; the absence of all religious Orders save one, and the failure of that one; the desertion of some of our best clergy, and no visible means of supplying their place; the vacancy of one See, and no apparent provision for the erection of others as circumstances may arise to render them necessary; the absence of episcopal visitation and control, with many other evils which might be enumerated;—assuming the truth of these facts, I say that it is not only the right, but the duty of the laity, in concert with the ecclesiastical Order, to take steps to correct such a mass of evil".

Following right on the heels of the provocative editorial from which we have already quoted, *Isidore's* very first contribution had poor Father McEncroe in trouble. Even if he was no longer owner of the paper, said the Archbishop, he must have countenanced, or at least known something about, the offending articles. Father McEncroe's reply to this charge, published as "An open letter to the subscribers of the *Freeman's Journal*", is worthy of careful study because, as we shall see, it was considered by the Archbishop to be nothing less than an exhortation to the people to continue their support of the paper. Here is the text of the letter: "Since Mr. Heydon took the management as well as the legal control of the *Freeman's Journal* on himself, I, of course, ceased to be answerable for the contents of the paper. I have, however, been charged with at least indirectly countenancing some communications in the journal, such as the letter signed 'Isidore' and of knowing something about the leading article that appeared in the issue of Wednesday, 21st.

"Now I beg to state that I know not who 'Isidore' may be, nor did I see his letter until it appeared in print...So far was I from approving of what was contained in the letter of 'Isidore' and other similar communications that I addressed two letters signed "An old colonist" correcting some of the misstatements and mistakes contained in the letters referred to. I never wrote a letter for the *Freeman* or for any other paper which I am not ready to acknowledge, and if necessary to defend. While I do not hold myself responsible for anything that may appear in the columns of the journal, unless for what I myself have contributed, still I am resolved to uphold and support the *Freeman's* Journal, until the Catholics of N.S.W. can get another paper better

deserving of their support. Having for the last eight years devoted much of my time and means, with no other earthly object in view but that of providing my fellow Catholics with a paper devoted to their interests and to the circulation of news interesting to every Catholic, to disown or to injure the publication of the journal until a better one is provided would be just as wise as to set fire to a house in order to destroy the cobwebs. The good sense and Catholic principles of Mr. Heydon will, I trust, prevent him in future from publishing any letters or articles which may be fairly considered injurious to our ecclesiastical superiors".

If Father McEncroe was unwilling "to disown or to injure" the *Freeman,* others of the brethren were not so liberally minded and very soon a meeting was convened at Darlinghurst for the purpose of having the paper suppressed. However, the Heydonites and Duncanites succeeded in packing the hall and in having passed a resounding vote of confidence in the editor, after having heard an eloquent plea by Mr. Duncan, who feigned great amazement at "the stir my poor production appears to have made at the Abbey. Is it possible, Sirs," he asked, "that so quiet and harmless a letter should have disturbed the Matins and Lauds of our worthy monks and so excited their fears and apprehensions that they must seek for safety, not in answering my remarks, which they ought to be competent to do, if they are answerable, but in annihilating the *Freeman's Journal,* the innocent medium of their transmission to the public?" Father Sheridan, who had convened the meeting, then found himself singled out for special attention, his new very elaborate presbytery providing an inexhaustible topic of discussion. And thus the unseemly wrangle went on week by week, kept alive by intemperate attacks from the pulpit no less than by anonymous letters in the press.

When Father McEncroe again intervened to express his disapproval of such conduct, which he said tended to wound charity and to weaken faith, Mr. Heydon replied as follows:—

"My dear Archdeacon, I should be sorry indeed to insert in the *Freeman* 'letters calculated to wound charity or to weaken faith'. I do not believe I have done so. No one knows better than you that my only wish, since I undertook the care of this periodical, has been to promote, as much as in me lay, the interests of religion. Certainly I have had my own notions as to the best way of doing so. Knowing the futility of advice from individual laymen, and that the clergy generally appeared unwilling to interfere, I resolved to promote an open discussion of our wants and defects and try what virtue lay in a free press.

That purpose was my principal object in joining you in the conduct of your paper; the hope of being able thoroughly to carry it out alone influenced me to accept the uncontrolled management and the legal responsibility of what appears in the columns of the *Freeman.* Now nothing has happened that I can see to cause me to change; and I cannot consent so far to recede from my own belief of what is right as to become now a party to the stifling of the legitimate voice of complaint. We of the laity may, some of us, be rather rough, but when our statements are founded in truth and our complaints are regarding our wants, we are not to be silenced till we have learned how to polish our language. For the third time I beg to assure you I will put no obstacle in the way of your resuming the *Freeman's Journal* into your own hands, and remain, my dear Archdeacon, Yours very sincerely, J. K. Heydon".

Heydon's offer to hand back control of the paper appears to have been genuinely sincere, and if accepted, even at this late stage, would undoubtedly have averted most if not all of the humiliations and scandals that so needlessly afflicted the Church during the ensuing twelve or eighteen months. The plain truth, however, was that Father McEncroe was not at liberty to avail himself of the opportunity, having been ordered some time previously by the Cardinal-Prefect of Propaganda to dispose of his interests in the *Freeman,* under pain of suspension.

Some little time after the date of Mr. Heydon's letter, a petition was presented to the Archbishop by a number of representative laymen, "embodying the wishes of the laity in regard to the administration of Catholic affairs". The petition asked for, among other things,

1. The introduction upon equal terms of clergymen of all orders, secular and religious.
2. The introduction of religious sisterhoods, and of religious and competent lay teachers.
3. The appointment of school inspectors.
4. Subdivision of the colony into bishoprics, and appointment of resident bishops.

Whatever may be thought about the opportuness of the request, there can be no gainsaying 'the vision splendid' of Plunkett, Heydon, Butler and the other men who presented it. Part of the introduction read as follows: "Looking at the varied capabilities of this country and its vast extent, it must, so we believe, at no remote period, become a great and powerful nation—probably the centre of an Empire of Nations —and if it be the will of God, as we devoutly hope it may, that our people should continue to maintain even their present proportion in the

number of its future millions, the branch of the Catholic Church established in N.S.W. will be one of the most important in the world, as regards the numbers, wealth, intelligence and the piety of her children".

The Archbishop, however, was in no mood to parley or to listen to fine language, and the only reply vouchsafed the petitioners was a particularly sharp rebuke administered in the shape of a *Monitum Pastorale,* issued from Melbourne on the Feast of St. Barnabas and signed by Drs. Polding, Goold and Willson, in which they found themselves charged with "following in the footsteps of Luther, sitting in ambush and striking in the dark". From what we know[1] of the subsequent careers of all those Catholic laymen, it does seem that the tone of the Pastoral was needlessly severe, and we can well imagine the hurt feelings with which Duncan in a couple of articles replied to it. (Those, as we shall see, were the articles about which Father McEncroe was questioned later on by Cardinal Barnabo).

With tempers then in such a frayed and explosive state, it obviously needed but the tiniest of sparks to set off a very dangerous situation, and, unfortunately, with Abbot Gregory about sparks could always be expected. When the explosion did come, it rocked Sydney as that old town on the Tank Stream had not been rocked for many a day; it even reverberated among the deserted, eviction-swept hills that stand like sentinels about the ruined village of Tullamore and caused Father McEncroe, who was in consultation there with his old friend, Father Patrick Dunne of Melbourne, to take the unprecedented step of asking the Holy Father to send out an Apostolic Delegate to N.S.W. "to bring about perfect unity in the Catholic body."

When Father McEncrose left Sydney, armed with a glowing letter of recommendation from the Franciscan Father P. F. O'Farrell to the Archbishop of Dublin, he carried with him from the Council of St. John's (of which he was a member) a commission to secure for that infant institution a suitable Rector. What the precise terms of the commission were is not known, but the following interesting letter

---

[1]It is worth noting that even when Mr. Heydon was so much in the black books of the Archbishop, his two boys, known to later generations as His Honour Charles Gilbert Heydon and the Hon. Louis Francis Heydon, M.L.C., were being educated by the Benedictines at Downside. Judge Heydon married a daughter of the convert parson T. C. Mackinson, who was Dr. Polding's secretary. Duncan's only daughter was a Sister of Charity at St. Vincent's. In the late seventies and early eighties Duncan as Editor won fresh laurels for the *Freeman* in its struggle for survival with the two successive but not successful rivals set up by Archbishop Vaughan.

seems to indicate that they were to obtain the Jesuits, if at all possible:

London, 12 March, 1859.

My Dear Fr. Therry,

I received yesterday through Dr. Woodlock your kind letter of 10 December with enclosed draft for £50, which I shall apply as directed. I am, thank God, very well, although I felt the cold very much. I am very glad I went to Rome, for I think I have removed some misconceptions there. The Jesuits have no competent men to spare at present for St. John's College, but it is very likely they will by the time the college shall be built, of which they gave me a fine Plan which I forwarded to Dean O'Connell by the last mail. I had a very kind letter from Dr. Ullathorne, and I was very well received by Cardinal Wiseman, who is likely to procure for us an Oxford man of high literary standing and now one of the Professors of the Catholic University of Ireland, as Rector until the Jesuits may be in a position to undertake the direction of the college. The Archbishop of Dublin told me at Rome that none of the Irish Christian Brothers could be spared for Sydney, but I hope to secure three or four of the Brothers of the Christian Schools belonging to the Society of Mary in France and England—they have about 20 Irish and English Brothers and have excellent schools in London and Glasgow; they are in every respect equal to the Irish Christian Brothers and the Superior-General is disposed to send some to Australia, especially as the Holy Father and the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda wish it. Now, as the £150 you gave me for bringing out the Jesuits cannot be wanted for the present, I hope you will approve of my using a part of that sum in paying for the passage of the Marist Christian Brothers. It cannot be better employed for the present. I saw Mr. Wentworth to-day, he enquired how you were. I pray daily for the peace and spiritual welfare of the Archdiocese..."

Of the Archdeacon's five weeks' sojourn in Rome, timed no doubt to coincide with the presence there of the Archbishop of Dublin and the Bishop of Melbourne, we get fleeting glimpses in Dr. Goold's diary:

"November 10th, 1858—Had a visit from Monsignor Talbot. He spoke of having received a long letter from Father McEncroe about the Australian Mission and that he expected him daily in Rome...

January 7th, 1859—Whilst at dinner Archdeacon McEncroe called. He dined with us. In the evening went with him to St. Peter's, whence we proceeded to S. Pietro in Montorio and to the church where lie the remains of Tasso...

January 15th—Paid a visit to the Superior of the Marists now in Rome. Father McEncroe was with me...

February 5th—Had a visit from Archdeacon McEncroe; he got his audience to-day...

February 6th—Dined at the Irish College; Cardinal Barnabo was one of the guests. Before dinner he spoke to me of Father McEncroe, alluding to the article and letter from Duncan signed 'Isidore' that appeared in the *Freeman,* in reference to the Monitorium Pastorale issued by the Bishops. He said that they disclosed their foolish designs...

February 11th—Called on Father McEncroe, who leaves to-morrow for England..."

Informed by Cardinal Barnabo that big decisions were about to be made, Archbishop Polding wrote from Sydney, submitting a list of names. But it was the advice of McEncroe and Goold that ultimately prevailed, backed no doubt by the powerful influence of Cullen, three of whose newphews were among the first four appointments made. When, exactly a quarter of a century later, a fourth nephew, the most distinguished of all, followed his three episcopal cousins to the Antipodes, it might indeed be said that the mission of 1859, so courageously undertaken in the face of official disapproval, had at last borne its crowning and noblest fruit. That Archdeacon John McEncroe was in fact the one primarily responsible for so effectively turning the mind, if not the steps, of the great Patrick Francis Moran Australiawards is clear from the following paragraph taken from the *Monograph* issued in 1902 in connection with the forthcoming sacerdotal golden jubilee of his Eminence.

"So far back as 1859, when Archdeacon McEncroe, of Sydney, visited Rome to urge the Holy Father Pope Pius IX to establish new episcopal Sees in Australia the petition was drawn up and personally presented, as the Archdeacon explained on his return to Australia, by 'an able and most courteous young friend, Professor Moran, of the Irish College'. Strange as it may appear in the light of after events, this was the first petition of any kind that Dr. Moran had the honour of personally presenting at the Vatican. The historic petition of 1859 was on behalf of the Catholics of N.S.W., and it was followed by the establishment of the dioceses of Brisbane, Maitland, Bathurst, Armidale and Goulburn. This was the beginning of the present grand hierarchy of Australia. Between 1859 and 1866 Dr. Moran acted as agent in

Rome for his old friend Bishop James Quinn, of Brisbane, and both in Rome and in Ireland, up to the time of his appointment as Bishop of Ossory in 1872, the 'Professor' attended to the wants of the dioceses of Maitland and Bathurst as the personal friend of their Lordships, Drs. Murray and Matthew Quinn. Indeed, so completely had he possessed himself of all the details of Catholicism in Australia that, even had he not left the See of Ossory in 1884, we should in all probability have had the *History of the Church in Australia* from his facile pen. When his Eminence did write the History which is now a standard work of reference in colonial libraries, it transpired that much of the material used in it had been collected by his Eminence long before the Holy See had selected him for the See of Sydney".

(To be concluded)

R. WYNNE.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

CATCH THOSE LITTLE FOXES, by a Carmelite Nun (95 pp. Herder Publication, London, 1954. 5/-. Eng.).

Though the author of this interesting book makes no reference to the little foxes, beyond giving us on the flyleaf the text from the *Song of Songs*, we can see as we read that she is basing her thoughts on the figurative sense of the verse: *Catch me the Fox, the little Fox there, thieving among the vineyards; vineyards of ours, all a-blossoming!* (Song of Songs, 3, 15). Many readers will prefer this book to all her previous writings. She no longer feels the need to be facetious, an understandable temptation to an author-nun who fears the reading public will balk at the idea of a book written by a Carmelite Nun. Many secular readers will be charmed into reading one chapter after another, carried on by the serene nobility that emanates from this nun's description of a Carmelite's day which begins at 4.30 a.m. and ends at 11 p.m.

But even in such a closely dedicated life where the keynote is prayer, the author seems to have met, yet passed by, the traps of mediocrity. We feel that she is deeply spiritual, with a wide knowledge of human nature, and Carmel seems to be as good a place to study it as any clinic. Talking of cheerful and uncheerful religious she says: "A happy frame of mind is in itself a great grace, because the reverse attitude is so easy to fall into." She goes on to observe: "You can kill a vocation by constantly grumbling at it, just as you can kill love or happiness of any kind by constant grumbling." Such practical observations make this book good reading for anyone, in or out of the cloister. In fact, its quiet tone makes it eminently suitable for the library of Catholic lay-folk.

Religious may be disappointed in it if they are expecting to find short cuts to holiness or even to contemplative prayer. It does not go very deeply into anything. The author has an enthusiastic admiration for the writing of Thomas Merton, and quotes several passages from his book, *The Sign of Jonas*. That she has not his genius is not to be considered a bad mark against her. She has her own moments of insight which are the genuine thing, as when she asks what is the price of the ideal for which we are striving. Her answer is: "The price, I think, is suffering—but the kind of suffering that is never to be confused with unhappiness".

M.O.

Dogmatic Theology

THE LITURGY AND DOGMA.

Every manifestation of religion and worship is based ultimately on faith. It presupposes an intellectual knowledge of God's existence, a recognition of the divine excellence, a humble submission of the soul to God, the Creator, Preserver and Last End of human life. If man did not believe in the existence of a Supreme Being, his heart would never be elevated to God in prayer. If man had not first glimpsed the majesty of God, the fire of sacrifice would never have been kindled on earth. The worship of God is necessarily a profession of faith.

The Christian liturgy is the public worship of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, Head and members. The worship which the Church pays to the Eternal Father is based on those revealed truths which form the *Credo* of Christianity. This connection between liturgy and dogma is emphasised by the Holy Father in the encyclical Mediator Dei. "In the liturgy we make explicit profession of the Catholic faith; not only by celebrating the various mysteries, not only by offering the sacrifice and administering the sacraments, but also by reciting and singing the Creed, by reading other documents and also the divinely inspired scriptures. Thus the whole liturgy contains the Catholic faith, in as much as it is a public profession of the faith of the Church".[1]

THE LITURGY—AN EXPRESSION OF FAITH.

The evidence of history continually bears witness to the close connection between liturgy and dogma. Whenever a truth of faith has achieved greater clarity of expression, whenever a doctrine has emerged triumphant from heresy, the results were immediately enshrined in the liturgy by means of a formula, a prayer, a ceremony. The clearer and more definite formulation of doctrine on the Word Incarnate, on the sacraments, on the privileges of the Virgin Mother of God, caused the liturgy to be enriched by new ritual formulas. The liturgical texts themselves reflected the light thrown on these doctrines by the declarations of the Church's teaching authority, and impressed them more effectively on the minds and hearts of the faithful.[2] The development of the liturgy has gone hand in hand with the progress of dogma.

---

[1]Mediator Dei, C.T.S., p. 25.
[2]ibid. p. 27.

Many of the texts which we now read in the liturgical books, were once the battle-cries of orthodoxy, fervent declarations of faith which came from the hearts of Christians during the crisis of heresy. In the fourth century the Arians took advantage of the formula *per Christum Dominum nostrum* to deny the Divinity of Christ. They argued that if prayers are addressed to God *through* Christ, then the Son is inferior to the Father—a mere intermediary between God and creatures. Immediately there appeared in the liturgy a second formula which concludes so many of the Church's prayers: *Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, Filium tuum, qui vivit et regnat cum Deo Patre in unitate Spiritus Sancti (ut) Deus per omnia saecula saeculorum.* Thus the concluding words of liturgical prayer became a public profession of faith in the Divinity of Christ—a clear expression of Christ's equality, as God, with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

During the same Trinitarian controversy the doxologies were added at the end of the psalms and hymns, as a solemn proclamation of the Divinity of the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. The little doxology, *"Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto",* reached the most brilliant period of its history, and became the pass-word and test of orthodoxy.[3]

In the fifth century the Church faced the crisis of Pelagianism, which threatened to destroy the whole fabric of the supernatural order by denying the necessity of grace. The catholic doctrine that grace is necessary for every action of the supernatural life, was emphasised by the repeated use of the versicles: *Deus in adiutorium meum intende* and *Adiutorium nostrum in nomine Domini.* These two versicles which now enclose the hour of Prime, are a humble petition for the grace of God, a daily acknowledgment that without God we can do nothing. A further echo of the Semi-Pelagian controversy is still preserved in the prayers of the Roman Missal. In the collect for the Mass of the first Sunday after Pentecost, we read: "O God, the strength of all who put their trust in Thee, mercifully hear our prayers, and because through the weakness of our mortal nature we can do nothing without Thee, grant us the help of Thy grace, that in fulfilling Thy commandments, we may please Thee both in will and deed." Again, on the sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost the Church prays in a similar fashion: "O Lord, we pray Thee that Thy grace may always precede and follow us, and make us continually intent upon good works." These prayers constitute

[3]cfr. M. Righetti, Storia Liturgica, vol. I, p. 195.

a precious summary of the catholic doctrine on grace—its absolute gratuity, its necessity for every supernatural action, the impossibility of persevering in good and achieving eternal life without the help of God. Thus the liturgy is a permanent record of the Church's struggle to preserve intact the deposit of faith. It is a prayerful witness to the triumph of orthodoxy.

The fact that the liturgy expresses faith is confirmed from the alterations and corruptions which the liturgical formulas have undergone among heretical sects. Separation from the Church in doctrines of faith leads to separation from the Church in the worship of God. Heretical sects have been constantly forced to modify the liturgical formulas which bear witness to the traditional faith. This principle can be abundantly illustrated from the changes introduced into the liturgy during the period of the Reformation.

The attitude of the English divines towards the doctrines of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation is reflected in the various editions of the Book of Common Prayer. The successive formulas for the administration of the Eucharist are an eloquent expression of the hesitations, the conflicts and the compromises which characterised the reformed theology. The reign of Edward VI marks the first departure from the formula of the Roman Liturgy: "Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam aeternam". On March 8, 1548, Cranmer's *Order of Communion* made its appearance; and the latin liturgy was replaced by the mother tongue in the administration of the sacrament. The words of the Communion Rite are more than a mere translation of the latin formula. "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, *which was given for thee,* keep thy soul into life everlasting." The insertion of the phrase, "which was given for thee", together with the accompanying rubric which refers to the priest ministering *the bread,* makes the new text suspect. The formula is ambiguous, and could be accepted without scruple by one who did not believe in the real and substantial Presence of Christ beneath the appearances of bread. This text was incorporated into the First Prayer Book, sanctioned by parliament in 1549.

Within less than four years the Prayer Book was again revised, and the formula for administering Communion was recast. The priest is now instructed to say: "Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith and thanksgiving." This time there is no ambiguity. Any allusion to the Real Presence is carefully avoided, and the Eucharist becomes a

memorial service, a rite of remembrance and thanksgiving. To receive Communion is to feed upon Christ spiritually by faith. Even the Lutheran doctrines are too Catholic for the reformers of this period, and there is a general decline towards the position of the Swiss Calvinists.

The rubrics of the new Prayer Book also indicate a change in doctrine. In the first edition of Edward's Prayer Book the minister was instructed to prepare only as much bread and wine as was required for the communion of the people. Bucer had criticised the rubric on the grounds that it favoured the belief in the permanence of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. "It is, he wrote, a cause of superstition, making the people think that if any of the bread and wine used for Communion remains over, it must not be employed for common uses, as though the bread and wine contained something divine or holy apart from their use for Communion."[4] This special rubric disappears from the revised Prayer Book of 1552. It is replaced by a new instruction which emphasises the abandonment of the ancient faith. "If any of the bread and wine remain over, the Curate shall have it to his own use."

These variations in the formula for administering Communion are an illustration of how the liturgy expresses faith.[5] The liturgical texts reflect the rapid doctrinal changes which carried Christian England across the dividing line between Catholicism and Protestantism. The liturgy was the voice with which the Anglican Church confessed her new religious beliefs and denied the ancient sacramental doctrines. The change in worship was the result of a change in faith.

THE LITURGY—A PROOF OF DOGMA.

Because the liturgy is a public profession of the Church's faith, it can also serve as a proof of dogma. The liturgy of the Church does not *create* faith, but follows from it. The sacred rites of divine worship are the fruit of Catholic belief. The liturgy is one of the forms in which Catholic tradition finds its expression. The formulas and rites of the liturgy can show how certain doctrines of faith were proposed by the Church at a given moment in history. The various phases in the progress of dogma are preserved and reflected in the liturgical texts.

---

[4]cited from G. Constant, The Reformation in England, p. 190.

[5]The communion formula had to pass through another stage of development before the definitive text, as it is now found in the Book of Common Prayer, was reached. The Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559 combined both the previous formulas into a single text which has remained unchanged: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving".

That is why, whenever a divinely revealed truth has to be defined, Popes and Councils have frequently used the liturgy as a theological source of arguments.[6]

The value of the liturgy as a theological source, can be illustrated from the recent Apostolic Constitution which defined as a dogma of faith that the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, was assumed body and soul to heavenly glory. The liturgical evidence for the Assumption is prefaced by these words: "In a universal and more splendid way the common faith of Pastors and Faithful is manifested by the liturgical solemnities which have been celebrated in ancient times both in the East and West. From this liturgical source the Fathers and Doctors of the Church never omitted to draw light. Indeed, since the sacred liturgy is a profession of heavenly truths, subject to the supreme Magisterium of the Church, it can supply arguments and testimonies of no little worth for deciding on a special point of Christian doctrine."[7]

In the liturgical books which contain the feast of the Assumption, expressions are found which testify that, when Mary passed from earth to heaven, what happened to her sacred body was perfectly in accord with her dignity as Mother of the Word Incarnate and with the other privileges granted to her by God. Thus in the *Sacramentary* which Hadrian the First sent to the Emperor Charlemagne we read these words: "Venerable in our eyes, O Lord, is the festival of this day, in which the Holy Mother of God underwent temporal death, but could not be held down by the bonds of death, since she was the Mother of Thy Incarnate Son, Our Lord." The truth indicated by this form of words is expressed with that sobriety and reserve of language which is characteristic of the Roman Liturgy.

The same doctrine is more strikingly and fully declared in the books of the ancient liturgy of East and West. The *Gallican Sacramentary* calls this privilege of Mary "an inexplicable mystery, all the more to be proclaimed because among men it is singular." In the Byzantine Liturgy the corporal Assumption of Mary is connected with her dignity as Mother of God and particularly with her privilege of virginal motherhood. The Eastern Church places these words on the lips of her priests in the recitation of the divine office: "To Thee, God, the King of the universe, gave what surpassed nature; for as in childbirth He kept thee a virgin, so also in the Tomb He kept thy body incorrupt, and together with thy soul glorified it by a divine translation."

From these texts it is also clear that the value of the liturgy as

[6]Mediator Dei, C.T.S., p. 25.
[7]cfr. *A.C.R.*, Jan., 1951, official Documents, p. 5-7.

a source of theology, is not restricted to that of the Roman Rite. Leo XIII in his famous letter *Orientalium dignitas* emphasised the reverence and esteem due to the liturgies of the East, which was the cradle of Christianity, the first fruit of the Redemption and the source from which the blessings of Christianity flowed to the Western World. "The maintenance in being of the Eastern rites is of more importance than might be imagined. The august antiquity which lends dignity to these various rites is an adornment of the whole Church, and a witness of the divine unity of the Catholic faith. They make known more clearly to the chief Churches of the East their apostolic origin, and, at the same time, throw light upon their intimate union, from the beginning of Christianity, with the Roman Church.

Perhaps nothing better proves the note of Catholicity in the Church of God than the singular homage paid by these ceremonies which vary in form, which are celebrated in languages venerable by their antiquity, and which are still further hallowed by the use made by them by the Apostles and Fathers of the Church. It is, it might be said, the renewal of that chosen worship offered to Christ, the Church's divine founder, by the Magi from the various countries of the East who came to adore Him. It is well to remark that, even if the holy rites were not instituted as a direct proof of the truth of Catholic doctrines, they none the less make known in marvellous fashion the principle of life in those doctrines."[8]

The Eastern liturgies are an important source of theology. Their texts and formulas are rich in dogmatic content, which, except for the comparatively modern offices such as Trinity and Corpus Christi, is not so prominently revealed in the austere and simple affirmations of the Roman Rite. The reason for this is to be attributed to the particular genius of the Oriental Church, which fashioned for itself a liturgy which was eminently speculative and theological. The prevailing literary style of the East tended to expound and develop the dogmatic truths which found expression in the splendour of their liturgical rites. From the East, too, came the great Christological heresies which, for many centuries, turned the Orient into a permanent battle-ground for doctrinal disputes. It is little wonder then, that the echo of an ardent and militant faith has been preserved in the texts of the Eastern Liturgies. For in every age of the Church, purity of faith has sought its expression in the worship of God. The law of faith determines the law of prayer.

C. TIERNEY.

[8]Acta Leo XIII, Romae, vol. XIV, pp. 360-361.

Moral Theology

COMMUNICATIO IN SACRIS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Cecilia, a young lady of Father Robert's parish, deplores the fact that her sister, who until recently was a practical Catholic, has arranged to contract marriage with a non-Catholic, according to the rites of the Church of England. Cecilia has been invited to act as bridesmaid for the occasion, and is inclined to accept in the hope that, by retaining the good will of her wayward sister, she may be able, at some future date, to have the union validated. She requests permission from Father Robert, and is told in no uncertain terms that she may not do evil even for a good purpose, and is forbidden to be present at the wedding in any capacity

2. Patricia, another parishioner, asks whether she may be bridesmaid at the wedding of two non-Catholic friends before a minister of the Church to which they belong. Father Robert consents after some hesitation.

3. Francis, a recent convert, is to be married in the Catholic Church with a nuptial Mass, and is anxious that his brother, who is a staunch Protestant, should be the best-man at the wedding. Father Robert willingly agrees.

What is to be said of Father Robert's solutions of his parishioners' problems?

FIDES.

REPLY.

Without raising the question of Father Robert's competence to give or refuse permission in any of these cases, it will be granted that, as the one charged with the care of their souls, it was his duty to explain the law to his parishioners and use his pastoral authority to urge its fulfilment.[1] His prohibition of Cecilia's attendance at the marriage of her Catholic sister in the Church of England was fully justified; he should not have allowed Patricia to be bridesmaid for her friends, and the correct procedure in the third case would have been to seek the consent of the Ordinary.

In a community where people of different religious convictions

[1]Parochus ex officio tenetur curam animarum exercere in omnes suos parocianos qui non sunt legitime exempti. Can. 464. Debet parochus .... errantes prudenter corrigere. Can. 467.

share the same social and commercial life, it is inevitable that difficulties will arise concerning their common participation in religious worship. May Catholics in any circumstances attend non-Catholic religious services? How far may non-Catholics be allowed to join in Catholic functions? The question becomes a practical one, more especially when social or family obligations would seem to urge that the religious aspect be not stressed more than is necessary and the civil character of the function given greater prominence. Weddings and funerals are common instances, as every Pastor knows from experience. It may be useful to examine the principles which must be the basis of a correct solution to these constantly recurring problems.

The term "non-Catholic", in its widest sense, includes all who are not members of the visible Church founded by Christ. Some are pagans or infidels, who have never professed or claimed to profess the Christian Faith, and have not been baptised. Others were once Christians but have entirely given up all adherence to the religion of Christ, and are known as apostates.[2] Concerning infidels and apostates we need not enlarge in the present reply, as the question of taking part in pagan religious rites is, fortunately, unlikely to arise in our environment; and apostates usually abandon all religion when they reject Christianity. By "non-Catholics" we understand, for our present purpose, those who call themselves Christians. Some have been baptised, but have broken the bond of Faith by heresy or the unity of Charity by schism; while others deny the efficacy of Baptism, but describe themselves as Christians because they accept what they consider the doctrines of Christ, and somehow hope for salvation through His merits. All these: schismatics, heretics and unbaptised persons who accept some of the Christian Faith, are organised into various religious bodies, have their places of worship, their minsters, and their ritual which they follow in their sincere, though mistaken, idea that they are thus giving to God the honour and glory He demands.

Religious worship is an expression of the doctrines of the worshippers. Schismatics do not deny the true Faith, and so their public worship of God does not contain a denial of revealed truth. A schismatical priest offers a true sacrifice and the sacraments he administers must be acknowledged as valid (with the possible exception of Penance, where the question of necessary jurisdiction would arise). He

[2]Can. 1325, par. 2.

partakes of the Priesthood of Christ, but his exercise of the Priesthood is vitiated because his right to represent the Church before God has been withdrawn by reason of his defection from union with the Vicar of Christ.[3] Taking an objective view of his position, we must admit that he persists in his rebellion against legitimate ecclesiastical authority by exercising his priestly functions, despite the prohibition of the Church. Any approval of this unlawful arrogation of the use of powers that have been forbidden him, or any acknowledgement of the lawfulness, either of his office or of the schismatical sect he represents, would be a sharing in his sin and in the sin of those who are in schism with him. In what circumstances attendance at religious ceremonies of schismatical Churches implies an approval of schism will appear as we proceed.

Heretics deny one or more of the articles of divine and catholic faith, but they do accept many of the truths contained in the Christian Revelation.[4] It is not surprising, then, to find that some of their religious rites do not differ from those of the Catholic Church, from which they were taken at the time of the defection of the sect. Thus, the administration of Baptism by heretics is a valid sacrament, producing in the soul all the effects of spiritual regeneration. Though they may not admit it, a valid Marriage between two baptised non-Catholics is always a true sacrament, conferring grace on those who place no obstacle in its way. Many of the prayers recited in the course of heretical worship, v.g. the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, except for unimportant verbal details, are identical with the same prayers during a Catholic religious ceremony. What make the act of religious worship unlawful in these cases are, firstly, lack of proper authority in the official who claims to be the approved representative of the Church of God before the Most High, and, secondly, the denial of the right of the lawfully ordained and accredited ministers of Christ's Church to be the sole persons who possess the mission to act in His name and on behalf of the faithful. The heretical minister is usually in a worse condition than the schismatical priest, as he generally lacks priestly ordination; and any act of his which implies the exercise of Orders is null and void. If it is unlawful to approve of the performance by a schismatical priest of acts proper to the clergy—acts which are valid though forbidden—we may say it is a more serious deviation from

[3]Schism is punished by ipso facto excommunication (Can. 2314, par. 1), and so a schismatical priest is forbidden to consecrate or administer the Sacraments or Sacramentals, except in the circumstances provided for in Law. (Can. 2261).

[4]Can. 1325, par. 2.

the right order to acknowledge what is truly priestly power and pre-eminence in one who is really a member of the laity.

The religious worship of heretical sects is frequently a manifestation of their heresy. We need not go beyond the Communion Service in search of an example, for what it is, but a denial of the sacrificial character of the Mass? The Funeral Service is also, by deliberate omission, a repudiation of the doctrine of the efficacy of prayers for the dead and of the existence of Purgatory. To recognise as legitimate such attempts at giving God the honour which is His due is to admit the heresy on which the religious rite is based, and is consequently to consent to heresy and incur its guilt.

Attendance at non-Catholic religious services is, therefore, forbidden by the divine and natural law, as often as it implies approval either of the lawfulness of separation from the one true Church founded by Christ, or acknowledgement of the truth of doctrines which are contrary to what is taught by the infallible magisterium of the Catholic Church, the pillar of ground or truth. It is likewise forbidden as often as there is danger of perversion, or of scandal to others.

The question to be answered is: when does attendance at non-Catholic religious worship imply approval of the sect or of its false doctrines?

One may attend a non-Catholic religious service *actively* or *passively,* in so far as one takes a part in the function, or is merely present, with a knowledge of what is taking place but without any positive contribution to the religious rite. Again, it is possible to be present *formally* with the intention, explicit or implicit, of recognising the lawfulness of the sect and its worship; or *materially,* i.e. devoid any such intention, or even with a positive act of inward protestation against superstition. Active assistance at *heretical* worship, i.e. religious ceremonies which are the expression of heresy, is always formal by reason of the *finis operis.* Passive assistance may be material: it does not necessarily pre-suppose an act of approval of the false rites, but is, nevertheless, compatible with inward recognition of the forbidden worship.

Active assistance consists in performing the actions intended to give worship to God. Obvious examples are to serve the Mass of a schismatical priest, or to attend an heretical minister at the celebration of the Communion service. Other instances are to act as sponsor at Baptism or Confirmation administered by non-Catholics, to sing the psalms or hymns at a non-Catholic service, to receive the sacraments,

whether validly or invalidly, from a non-Catholic minister of religion. In all these and like cases, active and positive assistance is given in the performance of divine worship which is always in defiance of the rights of the one true Church, and often enough a denial of her divinely revealed teachings.

Passive assistance is understood as physical presence, without any action which could be considered as sharing in the worship offered. It would exclude all recital of or joining in prayer, etc., but would not prevent the observance of the ordinary rules of good manners, v.g. by adopting an attitude of respectful silence, or, it would seem, conforming to the posture of the worshippers, by standing, sitting or kneeling.

With these distinctions in mind, we may quote Can. 1258 of the Code which reads:

1. It is unlawful for the faithful actively to assist in any way or to take part in the sacred worship of non-Catholics.

2. Passive or merely material presence, for the sake of civil esteem, duty or respect, for a grave reason, which in case of doubt should have the approval of the Bishop, may be tolerated at the funerals, weddings and other such celebrations of non-Catholics, provided there be no danger of perversion or scandal.

In the first paragraph of this Canon, where active assistance at non-Catholic worship is forbidden, no distinction is made between formal or material presence. The reason is that it is impossible to help in the execution of the service without approving of it, at least implicitly. If the rites in question are heretical (a Communion service) we have the approval of heresy which is always gravely sinful. When the religious ceremonies are the expression of those orthodox teachings which heretics profess in common with Catholics (the administration of Baptism), active assistance at them would seem to imply a recognition of the official status of the minister (his right to administer Baptism solemnly) and of the sect which he represents. In an extreme case, where the eternal salvation of a soul is at stake, it would be undoubtedly lawful to request Baptism from any person, even an heretical minister, or Penance from a validly ordained priest, no matter how grieviously he be given to heresy or rebellion against the Church. In the absence of a legitimate minister, in danger of death, the faithful may request also the other sacraments from any priest, provided there be no scandal or risk of perversion (Cf. Can. 2261, par. 3). There is

no question, in such circumstances, of approving of schism or heresy, for the Church permits and gives her authorisation to an unworthy minister to confer the Sacraments. He acts then not as a representative of a sect separated from the unity of the Church, but for this occasion as a legitimate minister of Christ. Except in the case of danger of death, it would appear that there can be no justification for actively assisting even at the rites which non-Catholics have in common with Catholics. Such assistance is certainly forbidden by the Canon quoted and so by ecclesiastical law. It is difficult to see how it is not also prohibited by the divine law, since it is active and formal co-operation in a repudiation of the rights of the Church.[5]

In the second paragraph of the same Canon, passive assistance is tolerated at certain religious functions of non-Catholics, under definite conditions. First, it must be material assistance, accompanied by no internal act approving of the lawfulness of the religious rite. Then, the purpose of the presence of the faithful at the functions must be plainly non-religious: the fulfilling of a civil duty, or for the sake of showing civil honour or respect. Thirdly, there must be a grave reason in the particular case which makes it necessary for civil honour to be given precisely by attendance at non-Catholic worship. In case of doubt, the decision as to the gravity of the reason is to be left to the Bishop. Not all non-Catholic religious functions are included in this toleration, but only funerals, weddings and such like solemnities, where the matter of civil duty or respect may become more easily a source of anxiety or an occasion of offence to non-Catholic friends or fellow citizens.

[5]Cf. Merkelbach. *Summa Theologiae Moralis,* 1947, vol. I, n. 754. Commuicatio activa seu participatio in ipsis sacris, scil. cultus publici, est illicita, quia est implicita approbatio exercitii cultus et agnitio sectae. Lugo (*De Virtute Fidei,* Disp. 22, nn. 10, 11) and Suarez (*De Fide,* Disp. XXI, sect. III, n. 5) treat of the question of receiving the sacraments from a heretic. Neither, however, seems to write of the question of having recourse to the minister of an heretical sect for the Sacraments. They treat rather of the heresy as such giving rise to a prohibition binding the faithful not to request the sacraments from those guilty of this crime. Thus Suarez: Addunt vero aliqui...ex vi haeresis prohibitum esse fidelibus accipere sacramenta ab haeretico...Sed contrarium verum est, *per se* loquendo...quia talis prohibitio neque est de iure divino, ut supra docui, neque in iure eccesiastico invenitur, seclusa censura. Dixi autem *per se loquendo,* quia per accidens id potest esse malum, vel ratione scandali quod aliis tribuitur; vel ratione periculi cui se exponit qui ab haeretico sacramenta petit, etc. Lugo (1583-1660 having in mind the penal legislation of the times deals with requestng the sacraments from a heretic who is not yet denounced to the ecclesiastical authorities. Though both are *auctores graves* we do not think they can be quoted in favour of opinion that, apart from the prohibition of the Church, it would be lawful to co-operate actively in those religious functions of a non-Catholic minister *qua talis,* even though these are performed correctly and contain no profession of heresy.

Finally, all danger of perversion to the faithful must be guarded against, and there must be no fear of scandal.

With these principles in mind let us solve the first two perplexities of Father Robert.

1. Cecilia's sister who contracts marriage in the Church of England is guilty of a double sin: by the sacrilegious act of an invalid marriage she enters a state wherein she leads a life of sin, and she actively takes part in a religious function of a non-Catholic sect. Those who request a Protestant minister to solemnise their marriage admit that he is duly authorised to celebrate marriages, not only as an official of the State for the sake of the civil effects of the contract, but also as a person competent publicly to invoke the blessing of God on the union. Catholics who contract marriage before a non-Catholic minister incur an excommunication,[6] which, be it noted, is listed in the Code under the heading: *De delictis contra fidem et unitatem Ecclesiae.* The reason for the censure is not the attempt at marriage, considered in itself, but the giving of matrimonial consent before a non-Catholic minister. Cecilia's attendance as a witness to the wedding would be co-operation with the sins of her sister, and Father Robert acted rightly in forbidding her to do so. When he further forbade Cecilia to attend her wayward sister's wedding in any capacity, even as a spectator or one passively and materially present, he was also quite correct. It was unreasonable of her sister to expect Cecilia to countenance her contracting marriage in defiance of the laws of the Church: and her attendance at the ceremony would amount to this. Further, the scandal inevitably associated with such a wedding would be increased by the public connivance of the bride's family, who doubtless enjoy the reputation of being well-instructed and practical Catholics.

2. Father Robert agreed to allow Cecilia to be bridesmaid at the wedding of her non-Catholic friends only after some hesitation. It has been stated by some that many non-Catholics regard marriage purely as a civil contract with no religious significance, and so attendance as a necessary witness is an act which has only civil meaning and is not participation in a non-Catholic religious service.[7] Again,

---

[6]Can. 2319, par. 1, n. 1.

[7]Cf. Noldin *Summa Theologiae Moralis* (1954), vol. II, n. 3, where he refers to Sabbetti quoted in Genicot's *Casus Conscientiae*, n. 45 (sic.) Genicot in casus n. 35 seems to take the responsibility himself for the statement: Sic officium mere civile praestare videntur e moribus communiter receptis, puellae in Statibus Foederatis Americae quae agunt principalem assistentem sponsae (first bride's maid). The reference to Sabbetti is about another matter; the obligation of professing

marriage between two baptised non-Catholics is a true sacrament; they are not forbidden to celebrate it in the presence of the minister of the religious organisation to which they belong; no sin is involved in the celebration of a sacred and sacramental rite, which is nowhere forbidden by the authority of the Catholic Church? It may have been these arguments which swayed Father Robert when he acceded to Cecilia's request. A little further hesitation may have resulted in a different solution to his doubts. Many non-Catholics do not regard marriage as anything but a civil contract, and for that reason quite a few of them are satisfied with a civil ceremony in the presence of the Registrar. Others, however, feel that the occasion is sacred, and marriage should be entered only with the blessing of the Church. In between, there are those who admit the civil nature of the contract, but nevertheless consider it more correct to have some religious ceremony associated with the beginning of the married life. Whatever be the motive which impels them to seek the assistance of a minister of religion at their wedding, his presence makes it a religious function. The ideas of the contracting parties on the need of a religious ceremony do not enter into the question. What matters is that they do actually invoke the ministrations of a minister of religion, and their wedding is undoubtedly a religious function. The official witnesses are needed according to the ritual of the sect; without them the marriage would not be permitted. It is, we think, impossible to escape the conclusion that their participation is not merely material and passive; it is active, and implies a recognition of the religious authority of the minister who solemnises the marriage.

The sacramental character of the marriage between two baptised non-Catholics does not justify the active participation of Catholics in the ceremony, any more than the validity of any other non-Catholic rite would be an argument in favour of the lawfulness of active participation in it. The objection to the non-Catholic marriage does not spring from the action of the parties who are the actual ministers of the Sacrament, so much as from the religious celebrations which are inseparably associated with it. These are performed by one whose claims to be an accredited minister of the true Church must be unequivocally rejected. It seems to us that to act as an official witness at any marriage contracted before a non-Catholic minister is always active participation in the religious rites of non-Catholics and so never permissible. Father

---

the Faith by the public reception of Baptism. We think it inaccurate to state that in Australia the position of bride's maid at a non-Catholic wedding is one of purely civil significance; nor de we understand how it could be.

Robert should have refused his consent to Cecilia's request in this case also. He may have permitted her to be present in the Church at the wedding as a guest, if he were satisfied the conditions given above were verified.

3. With regard to the third difficulty, namely, allowing a non-Catholic to act as witness to a marriage celebrated according to the rites of the Catholic Church, we have an explicit direction of the Holy See:[8] "Heretics may not be permitted as witnesses (to a marriage); but their presence may be tolerated by the Ordinary, if there be no scandal".

The reason for the decree of the Holy Office just cited is that Marriage is a Sacrament, and as the witnesses are necessary for its validity, they actively co-operate in the public rites of the Church. It is unnecessary to remark that the validity of a marriage is in no way affected by the religious affiliation or canonical status of the witnesses. All that is required is that they have the use of reason and of their sense faculties, and can thus testify that the marriage took place. It is scarcely fitting, however, that those who refuse to recognise the divine mission of the Church of Christ should be allowed to share in her sacred ceremonies. To admit then indiscriminately could easily give rise to the impression that there was no real difference between all who profess to be Christians, and thus pave the way for religious indifference. When scandal is likely, the natural law would forbid the admission of any but Catholics as witnesses to a marriage, but it is for the Ordinary to decide when the circumstances would not likely give rise to scandal, and permit what cannot be avoided without difficulty.

In general, non-Catholics who are baptised are legally considered as excommunicated persons. Active participation in Catholic religious functions is forbidden them, but passive assistance is allowed.[9]

* * * *

CONDITION FOR BINATION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A priest binates each Sunday in a country church. Occasionally, owing to floods and bad roads, the attendance may drop to four or five persons. In the circumstances may the priest say the second Mass, acting on the presumption that the Ordinary who has given him the

[8]H.O. 19 August, 1891. Fontes Codicis IV. 1044.
[9]Can. 2259, par. 2.

faculty must be aware of the local conditions and has placed no restrictions on the use of the faculty?

PAROCHUS.

REPLY.

The faculty of saying two Masses may be given by the Ordinary by virtue of can. 806, par. 2. It is available for Sundays and Feasts of precept, when, because of the shortage of priests, a notable portion of the people could not otherwise hear Mass. In many Faculty Sheets, which we have seen, this last condition is expressly stated, and the conscience of the priest is charged with seeing that it is fulfilled before he makes use of the permission to binate.[10] Even though it may not be so explicitly mentioned by the Ordinary, the priest can reasonably be expected to know the general law on the matter, and that the purpose of bination is the convenience of a considerable number of the faithful, who would otherwise be deprived of Mass. There is no definite rule as to the number of people who would be adversely affected if the second Mass were not celebrated, but by any computation four or five is not a *pars notabilis*. As for the others, who were kept away by the inclemency of the weather, they are excused because of impossibility, and the Church would also excuse the few who came, in preference to permitting a priest to say more than one Mass on the same day. Perhaps, a priest may be justified in giving a liberal interpretation to the condition which requires a notable number of the people and say the the second Mass in order to keep faith with those who went to the great inconvenience of coming to the Church, notwithstanding the inclement weather, etc. If the Law leaves it to the prudent judgment of the Ordinary to give the faculty of bination, prudence must, likewise, be the guide of the priest in the use of the faculty.

JAMES MADDEN.

---

[10]The Specimen Faculty Sheet contained in the Appendices to the IV. Plenary Council gives the faculty to binate thus: Binandi diebus domincis et festivis de praecepto ob populi necessitatem de qua re conscientia tua graviter oneratur.

Canon Law

DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE "IN FAVOREM FIDEI"

Dear Rev. Sir,

I would be very grateful if you would provide the answer to the following question in the Canon Law section of the A.C.R. The difficulty concerns a marriage validly contracted and consummated between a baptized and a non-baptized person.

In Vol. III, n. 518, 2 of Noldin-Schmitt, ed. 1938, p. 525, I find: "Matrimonium fidelium ratum et consummatum etiam extrinsecus indissolubile est . . .", followed by this observation: "Indissolubilitas asserenda est etiam matrimonio consummato, quod per dispensationem Summi Pontificis a fideli cum infideli contrahitur, *sed non constat utrum simpliciter sit indissolubile, an solum de facto nunquam in eo dispensatum fuerit.*"

And in Aertnys-Damen, Tomus II, n. 924, Scholion II/d (Marietti, 1950, p. 687): "Etiam matrimonium ex dispensatione valide initum et consummatum inter baptizatum in Ecclesia Catholica vel ad eam conversum et non baptizatum *logice tamquam dissolubile habendum est. Sed de facto exempla dissolutionis non habentur.*"

But then I find in the December issue of the "Clergy Review", 1951, page 375: "The Holy See possesses the power of dissolving a marriage validly contracted between a baptized person and one not baptized, provided the requisite conditions for the exercise of this power are present." The author then proceeds to illustrate the statement with references to such a dissolution granted by Pius XI on 5th November 1924, as well as the Monterey-Fresno case, quoted by Bouscaren.

Would you be so kind as to comment on the Clergy Review article in the light of the two quotations taken from the Moral Theology manuals?

W.J.M.

REPLY.

From the manner in which the query is proposed it is clearly evident that our correspondent is principally concerned to secure an explanation of statements which seem to differ from each other, and not so much to secure the theological reasons and foundation for the power of the Church in this matter of the dissolution of marriage. Consequently, keeping that purpose in mind, we shall divide our comm-

entary into three sections: (1) The content of each statement will be explained as it stands: (2) This will be followed by a general commentary on the point at issue: (3) Each statement will be evaluated in accordance with the principles set down in this general commentary, and this evaluation will also clarify the relationships between the three original statements.

FIRST SECTION.

A. The first part of the quoted statement of Noldin-Schmitt affirms the principle set down in Canon 1118, namely, that a valid and consummated marriage between baptized persons cannot be dissolved by the parties themselves or by any extrinsic power. There can be no dispute about this principle. The second part of the statement—and this part contains the difficulty for our correspondent—refers to the case of a consummated marriage between a person baptized in the Catholic Church or converted to it from heresy or schism and an unbaptized non-Catholic, contracted with a dispensation from the diriment impediment of Disparity of Cult. In the quoted statement Noldin-Schmitt states that indissolubility is to be asserted of such a marriage, but he adds that it is not clear whether such a marriage is simply indissoluble or whether it is to be said to be indissoluble because in fact a dispensation from such a marriage has never been granted.

It should be kept in mind that Noldin-Schmitt is not referring here to a valid and consummated marriage between a baptized non-Catholic and an unbaptized non-Catholic; for, as this author clearly points out in another place, such a marriage can be dissolved *in favorem fidei* by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff (op. cit., n. 525).

B. To understand fully the quoted statement from Aertnys-Damen it will help considerably to know what has been asserted by this author in the paragraph that immediately precedes the quoted statement.

He has asserted that a marriage between an unbaptized person and a person baptized outside the Catholic Church, even though consummated, can be dissolved by the Roman Pontiff *in favorem fidei*, so long as it is not consummated if and after the hitherto baptized party receives baptism. Hence, he proceeds to say in the quoted statement that it follows logically that even a consummated marriage between an unbaptized person and one baptized in the Catholic Church, contracted with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult, should be regarded as dissoluble. However, he adds that in point of fact there are no actual examples of the dissolution of such marriages.

C. The statement taken from the "Clergy Review", namely, that the Holy See can dissolve a valid marriage between a baptized and a non-baptized person (provided certain conditions are fulfilled), can refer to two possible cases since no restriction is made: (a) It can refer to a validly contracted marriage between a baptized non-Catholic and an unbaptized non-Catholic: (b) It can refer to a validly contracted marriage between a Catholic and an unbaptized non-Catholic, contracted with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult, since otherwise it would be invalid. And the following part of the article, as well as the quoted statement itself, makes clear that the writer is asserting that the Church has power to dissolve such marriages even though they have been consummated, provided that, if the unbaptized party receives baptism, the marriage is not consummated after that event; for in that case it would become a *matrimonium ratum et consummatum,* and no human power could dissolve it.

SUMMARY OF THE FIRST SECTION:

(a) The three authors agree that a consummated marriage between a baptized non-Catholic and an unbaptized non-Catholic can be dissolved *in favorem fidei* by Papal authority: (b) Any discrepancy between the three authors is concerned only with the question of the dissolution of a consummated marriage between a baptized Catholic and an unbaptized non-Catholic, contracted with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult: (c) Noldin-Schmitt states that such a marriage is to be regarded as indissoluble; Aertnys-Damen states that it is dissoluble, but has not been dispensed; and the Clergy Review writer states that it is dissoluble and has been dispensed, and he quotes the Monterey-Fresno case as an example of such a dissolution.

SECOND SECTION.

In regard to a marriage between a baptized non-Catholic and an unbaptized person, even though it has been consummated, the Roman Pontiff can and does grant a dissolution *in favorem fidei,* provided certain conditions are verified. The first decision to come to light in this type of case was given on 5th November, 1924, the case having been submitted to the Holy Office by the Bishop of Helena, Montana. Since that date many such dissolutions have been granted by the Roman Pontiff. It can readily be seen from the date of the original case that the use of this power by the Roman Pontiff is of comparatively recent occurrence. This, however, may well be accounted for by the fact that before the Code such a marriage between a baptized non-Catholic

and an unbaptized person would have been invalid on the ground of the existence of the impediment of Disparity of Cult. Before the Code this impediment existed between non-baptized persons and validly baptized persons, whether these latter were baptized in the Catholic Church or not. Hence, a declaration of the nullity of such a marriage would have been given rather than the dissolution under consideration, for a dissolution supposes the validity of the marriage.

The principle on which the use of this power is founded is contained in the words of the decree of the Holy Office concerning the celebrated case to which reference has just been made: " . . . The Eminent and Most Rev. Cardinals . . . decreed: that the Holy Father should be applied to for the favour of a dissolution in favour of the faith *of the natural bond of the first marriage* . . . " (cfr. Bouscaren, Canon Law Digest, Vol. I, p. 553). Thus the bond of valid marriage between a baptized non-Catholic and a non-baptized person was described as a "natural bond", and hence not a sacramental bond. This declaration was in accord with the more common opinion among theologians that a marriage between a baptized and an unbaptized person is not a Sacrament, since the marriage bond is indivisible and an unbaptized person is incapable of receiving a Sacrament.

Notwithstanding the decision in this case—and similar decisions followed—there was still discussion about the possibility of an application of this power in the case of a marriage between a Catholic and a non-baptized person contracted in the Catholic Church with a dispensation from the impediment of Disparity of Cult. Some authors held that it could not be used in a case of this nature.

In theory it would seem that this power could be used even in such a case. After all, a marriage between a baptized and an unbaptized person has been described by the Holy Office as a *natural bond,* which is the foundation for the exercise of this power, and the mere granting of a dispensation of itself does not change the nature of this bond. Therefore, if the Roman Pontiff could use this power in regard to a marriage between a baptized non-Catholic and an unbaptized person (contracted without a dispensation from Disparity of Cult which is not necessary), there would not appear to be any reason why he could not also use this power in regard to a marriage between a baptized Catholic and an unbaptized person, contracted with the necessary dispensation, since there would be no intrinsic difference between the two cases. In practice, however, no such dispensations were given, possibly

because the Church did not will to dissolve a marriage which she had sanctioned by granting a special dispensation, and possibly because the faithful might tend to contract these dissoluble marriages rather than seek marriages with baptized persons.

However, it has now come to light that in very recent years a mitigation of this discipline has taken place, and there have been cases in which a marriage between a baptized Catholic and a non-baptised person, contracted with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult, has been dissolved *in favorem fidei* by the Roman Pontiff (cfr. Bouscaren, Canon Law Digest, Vol. III, pp. 485-488). These two dissolutions were granted on 17th July, 1947, and 27th January, 1950, respectively; and, moreover, in each case the dissolution was granted independently of the consummation of these marriages before the baptism of the hitherto unbaptized party.

The first case, presented from the diocese of Monterey-Fresno, was originally an application for a dissolution of the marriage on the ground that it had never been consummated. The Holy Office stated: "After having carefully compared the aforesaid records with those that had preceded them in the same case, and having carefully examined them, this Supreme Congregation decided that all doubt had not been removed regarding the alleged non-consummation of the marriage; but nevertheless it decided that the favour of dissolution which was asked for could be granted on another ground, namely *in favorem fidei*, because the woman petitioner was unbaptized during the entire time of her cohabitation with her spouse. Consequently, even though the marriage was contracted with a dispensation from the impediment of Disparity of Cult, yet in view of the peculiar circumstances of the case, and especially the probable non-consummation of the marriage, His Holiness by Divine Providence Pope Pius XII, in the audience granted to the Most Excellent Assessor of the Holy Office on July 17th, 1947, graciously deigned to grant the favour of dissolution of the aforesaid marriage; so that the petitioner, after having been converted and received baptism, can contract a new marriage with a Catholic man . . . " (cfr. Bouscaren, loc. cit.).

The second case was a petition for a dissolution *in favorem fidei* of the natural bond of marriage between a Catholic man and an unbaptized woman, convalidated with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult and consummated. The Papal dissolution was given in answer to the petition of the Eminent Fathers of the Holy Office that "recommenda-

tion is to be made to His Holiness in favour of the dissolution of the above marriage in favour of the faith, so that the petitioner, after having received baptism, may validly and licitly contract a new marriage before the Church with a Catholic man" (cfr. Bouscaren, loc. cit.). A subsequent rescript from the Holy Office (4th May, 1950) stated that the Catholic man in the case was now free to contract a new marriage in the Church, even with a non-Catholic woman.

THIRD SECTION.

We will now return to the three statements quoted by our correspondent, and examine them in the light of the preceding remarks. This evaluation will also clarify the relationships between these remarks in which the authors appear to differ from each other.

A. The Statement of Noldin-Schmitt: It appears to us to be clear that the part of this statement which implies that a valid and consummated marriage between a Catholic and an unbaptized person (contracted with the necessary dispensation) may be extrinsically indissoluble (non constat utrum simpliciter sit indissolubile) cannot be allowed to stand. Theoretically it could be dissolved, and practically it has been dissolved. The part of the statement in which the author asserts it is possible that such a marriage possesses a de facto indissolubility arising from the fact that it has never been dispensed (an solum de facto nunquam in eo dispensatum fuerit), while it can no longer be allowed to stand, could be explained by the fact that no such cases of dissolution had come to light at that time. The edition of Noldin-Schmitt quoted by our correspondent is 1938, while the two cases of dissolution referred to above occurred in 1947 and 1950 respectively.

However, we have been able to procure a later edition (1954) of Noldin-Schmitt, and a notable change has been introduced which affects the matter under discussion. In n. 525 the author quotes with approval a paragraph from Capello (De Matrimonio, 1950, n. 791) in which Capello states that the Roman Pontiff can dissolve "vinculum matrimonii initi inter partem non baptizatam et baptizatam in Ecclesia Catholica cum dispensatione super impedimento disparitatis cultus." While this is in line with the doctrine we have set down in the second section of this article, it appears to conflict with the statement of Noldin-Schmitt which is quoted by our correspondent and is still retained in the new edition.

B. The Statement of Aertnys-Damen: The part of this author's statement which asserts that a valid and consummated marriage between

a Catholic and an unbaptized person is dissoluble is in accord with what has been said. The concluding part of the statement (de facto exempla dissolutionis non habentur) can be explained, we think, by assuming that he was not aware that the power had been exercised. This is not difficult to understand when it is remembered that, of the two cases of which we have knowledge, the second was granted in the same year as the edition of Aertnys-Damen quoted by our correspondent (1950), and the first was granted only three years previously; and, being private replies, they did not come to light immediately.

C. The Statement in the Clergy Review: This statement is to be accepted as it stands. It is clear from a later part of this Clergy Review article that its author had the advantage of being aware that at least one dispensation had been granted *in favorem fidei* from a marriage between a Catholic and an unbaptized person, contracted with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult; thus this author actually refers to the 1947 dispensation spoken of above.

CONCLUSION.

A valid marriage between an unbaptized person and a baptized person, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, is intrinsically indissoluble in that it cannot be dissolved by the parties themselves. However, such marriages do not possess an absolute extrinsic indissolubility, and hence they may be dissolved by the Roman Pontiff provided certain conditions are verified: (a) The non-baptism of at least one party during the whole period of conjugal life: (b) The absence of marital relations after the baptism of the hitherto unbaptized party: (c) The moral impossibility of reconciliation: (d) The moral certainty of the absence of scandal from the granting of the dissolution.

If these conditions are fulfilled the favour of the dissolution of the natural bond of marriage can be granted to the non-Catholic party who becomes a Catholic and wishes to marry a Catholic. So far the dispensation has rarely been granted in the case where the marriage has been contracted with a dispensation from Disparity of Cult, and it remains to be seen whether there will be any notable mitigation of the Church's attitude.

G. C. GALLEN.

Liturgy

SOME NOTES ON VOTIVE MASSES.

To meet the demands of not infrequent enquiries about votive Masses and to take account of certain changes introduced by the Decree of the Sacred Congregation Rites on the simpler form of the rubrics (23rd March, 1955), it is proposed here to outline the rules for the celebration of votive Masses in the circumstances that most commonly occur.

A votive Mass is one that does not conform to the Office of the day, but is selected according to the wishes of the celebrant or of the person who makes an offering for the Mass or of some ecclesiastical authority. The Mass should normally conform to the Office of the day, hence some cause is required to celebrate a votive Mass, but the nature of the cause will vary according to circumstances, e.g., any reasonable cause is sufficient to say a private votive Mass, whereas a grave public cause is necessary for a solemn votive Mass. Granted the existence of an appropriate cause, account must then be taken of the rank of the Office of the day to determine whether or not it will allow the celebration of a votive Mass.

Votive Masses may be distinguished according to their extrinsic or their intrinsic solemnity. The extrinsic solemnity concerns the manner in which the Mass is celebrated: High Mass, Missa cantata or Low Mass. By reason of intrinsic solemnity, a votive Mass may be either solemn, privileged, or private. The significance of this second distinction will appear later.

THE CHOICE OF A MASS.

It is important to determine what Masses may be chosen as a votive Mass, since not every Mass may be used. The section of the Missal containing the votive Masses divides them into two groups. In the first group one may find a series of Masses arranged for various days of the week, and which may be celebrated as conventual Masses on the days indicated whenever the rubrics permit this. (Subsequently, this group will be referred to as the conventual votive Masses). In the second group are collected votive Masses for different occasions, such as the Nuptial Mass, the Mass for Peace, Thanksgiving, etc. The rubrics governing the use of the Masses of the first group as conventual Masses concern very few of our readers, so we may be excused if we dispense with any further discussion of them. However, the rubric

found after these Masses states that, apart from the conventual Mass, any one of them may be used on any day as a votive Mass, provided that the rubrics allow a votive Mass on the day. In regard to the Masses of the second group, the same rubric allows their use as the need arises, with the exception of the votive Mass for the Coronation (and the Anniversary) of the Pope, the Anniversary of the Appointment, Translation or Consecration of a Bishop, which Masses may not be celebrated as private votive Masses. It will be observed that for a number of the Masses in this group, e.g., Mass for Ordination, Thanksgiving, only the prayers of the Mass are proper, and these are added, under the one conclusion, to the prayers of the Mass that must be said according to the rubric printed in each case. In addition to these Masses certain other ones may be celebrated as votive Masses, namely, some of the feasts of the Divine Persons, our Lady and the Saints.

The Divine Persons. Not every Mass of the feasts or mysteries of the Divine Persons may be celebrated as a votive Mass. The Missal has a special votive Mass in honour of the Blessed Trinity and in honour of the Holy Ghost. Both of these Masses are found among the conventual votive Masses, and these must be used for a votive Mass, not the Mass of the feast of the Blessed Trinity or that of Pentecost Sunday.

In honour of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Missal provides special votive Masses of: the Blessed Sacrament, the Holy Cross, the Passion, Christ the High and Eternal Priest. Further, the Masses of certain feasts of our Lord may be used as votive Masses, i.e., the Holy Name, the Holy Family, the Sacred Heart, the Precious Blood and Christ the King. That the Masses of these feasts may be used as votive Masses is indicated in the Missal by the rubric: In missis votivis post Septuagesimam, etc. The Masses of other feasts of our Lord, e.g., the Circumcision, the Epiphany, may not be used as votive Masses. In places where, by an Indult of the Holy See, other special feasts in honour of our Lord are observed, as the feast of the Eucharistic Heart or the Instruments of the Passion, these Masses may be celebrated as votive Masses.

The Blessed Virgin Mary. A votive Mass in honour of our Lady must be selected from among the following: i. the Mass appropriate to the season among the five Masses of S. Maria in Sabbato; ii. the Mass of the feasts of the Immaculate Conception, the Seven Dolours or the Immaculate Heart; iii. the Mass of some other title of

our Lady, but only in places where the feast of that title is celebrated by virtue of an Apostolic Indult, e.g., the feast of our Lady Help of Christians for the whole of Australia and New Zealand, or the feast of our Lady of Perpetual Succour in those dioceses in which the feast is celebrated.

The Saints. A votive Mass may be celebrated in honour of any canonised Saint whose name is inscribed in the Roman Martyrology. If the Saint has a proper Mass, this should be said; if part only of the Mass is proper, the proper parts must be used and the rest taken from the appropriate common; when no part of the Mass is proper, the whole Mass is taken from the Common, according to the dignity of the Saint and the season in which the Mass is being celebrated. The matter of season is especially applicable to the Masses of Martyrs, since the Masses of the Common of Martyrs outside of Eastertide differ from those during Eastertide. When saying a votive Mass, outside of Eastertide, of a martyr whose feast usually falls within the Easter season, the Mass must be chosen according to the season, retaining only those parts of the Mass of the feast that are proper. In practice, this usually presents no great difficulty for most missals indicate the particular Mass that is to be chosen for the season.

The number of Saints who are now simply commemorated in the day's Office has increased since the recent changes in the rubrics, but provision has been made for the celebration of the Masses of these saints. During the year, i.e., apart from Advent, Lent, Quarter Tense, vigils and octaves, when the Office of the day is of the feria, the Mass, even the conventual Mass, may be either of the weekday or of the Saint commemorated. If the Mass of the Saint is chosen, it is said with festal rite, i.e., with the Gloria, and is not a votive Mass.

The rules that are applicable to the Masses of certain Saints may be summarized as follows:—

i. *The Holy Angels.* The special votive Mass of the Angels for use as a conventual Mass on Tuesdays may always be used as a private votive Mass. The Mass of St. Gabriel (24th March), Guardian Angels (2nd Oct.), St Raphael (24th Oct.), or St. Michael (the Mass of 8th May in Eastertide, that of 29th Sept. at other times during the year) may also be used.

ii. *St. John the Baptist.* The Mass of 24th June may be said, with the changes required by the season as given in the missal.

iii. *St. Joseph.* The special votive Mass given in the missal as a conventual Mass on Wednesdays must always be used for a votive Mass.

iv. *The Apostles.* A special votive Mass of the two apostles Sts. Peter and Paul is found among the conventual votive Masses as an alternative Mass for Wednesday. The votive Mass of St. Peter alone is given in the missal after the feast of 29th June. The votive Mass of St. Paul alone is that of 30th June. The Mass of 27th December is used for the votive Mass of St. John. For the other Apostles the missal indicates in the Mass of their respective feast days what Mass should be used as a votive Mass. A votive Mass in honour of all the Apostles is found in the missal as an alternative conventual votive Mass for Wednesdays. This Mass may also be used for any individual Apostle who has no proper Mass, e.g., St. Jude.

v. The missal provides a special votive Mass of All Saints after the feast of 1st November.

vi. The Mass of a *Beatus* may not be celebrated as a votive Mass except by special Indult of the Holy See.

SOLEMN VOTIVE MASS.

A solemn votive Mass *pro re gravi et simul publica causa* is a Mass that is celebrated by order, or with the consent, of the local Ordinary, for some grave and public cause, in the presence of a large gathering of the people. The Mass must be sung. The permission of the local Ordinary must be obtained for each occasion. The Commentators, following several decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, enumerate various causes that may be considered grave and public. In general, the cause is grave when the benefit, either temporal or spiritual, that is sought is important; it is public when it concerns the welfare not of individuals but of a community, e.g., nation, parish, or religious institution. Thus, the obtaining of peace, rain, fine weather; the avoidance of war, or an epidemic; the restoration to health of the Pope, Bishop, Head of the State; public thanksgiving for some public blessing; the opening of a parochial mission, or of the scholastic year in a school or seminary—all of these may be considered grave and public causes. On the other hand, the following are not considered sufficient cause for a solemn votive Mass:—Profession ceremony, installation of a Parish Priest, a first Mass of a newly ordained priest, a jubilee, a novena, a procession.

A solemn votive Mass is sung with *Gloria* (unless celebrated in

violet vestments) and Creed. A commemoration must be made of any Sunday; weekday of Advent or Lent; weekday and Saturday of September Quarter Tense; Greater Litanies (25th April). A Sequence is always omitted. The Preface is that proper to the Mass; if the Mass has no proper Preface, then that of the season, otherwise the Common Preface. Attention might here be drawn to the fact that some Prefaces that were previously regarded as proper, and which are noted in the Missal as such, are no longer proper since the Decree of 23rd March, 1955. For instance, the Preface of the Nativity is no longer proper to the Mass of the Blessed Sacrament, nor is the Preface of the Apostles proper to the Mass of a Pope, in both cases the Common Preface must be sung, unless there is a seasonal Preface. Furthermore, a commemoration in the Mass no longer brings with it a proper Preface. The Last Gospel will always be the beginning of the gospel of St. John.

A solemn votive Mass is forbidden:—

a. on Sundays of I class
b. on doubles of I class
c. on Ash Wednesday; Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week
d. on vigil of Christmas and Pentecost
e. during the octaves of Easter and Pentecost
f. on All Souls' Day
g. on 2nd February and on the days of the Greater and Lesser Litanies in those churches where the candles are blessed and the Litanies sung, and where there is only one Mass in the church
h. on days on which is celebrated or commemorated the feast or vigil of an identical mystery of our Lord or of the same Saint, in whose honour the solemn votive Mass is celebrated.

On all the above days the solemn votive Mass is excluded and may not even be commemorated by adding the prayers of the impeded votive Mass to the prayers of the Mass of the day, except in those cases in which the prayer is prescribed, e.g., Ordination Mass, Nuptial Mass, Forty Hours' Prayer. In place of the votive Mass, the Mass of the day must be sung, but only those commemorations are made that would be made in a solemn votive Mass, viz., any Sunday; weekday of Advent or Lent; weekday or Saturday of September Quarter Tense, Greater Litanies (25th April). The mysteries of our Lord that are regarded as identical are: the Blessed Eucharist, the Sacred Heart, the

Passion, the Holy Cross, the Most Holy Redeemer, the Most Precious Blood, and Christ, High and Eternal Priest. Likewise, a votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception could not be celebrated on a Saturday when the Office of the day is S. Maria in Sabbato. On the days on which the identity of mystery or person occurs, the Mass must be that of the feast, commemoration or vigil, but it will be celebrated with the rite of a solemn votive Mass and only the commemorations made as indicated above.

FORTY HOURS' PRAYER.

In order that the Masses of the Forty Hours' Prayer should enjoy the liturgical privileges accorded them by the Clementine Instruction, the Prayer must be continuous, and the Masses must be High Masses unless an Apostolic Indult has been obtained that excuses from these conditions.

The Mass of the first and third days of the Prayer will normally be the votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament, sung with the rite of a solemn votive Mass, i.e., with Gloria and Creed. Commemorations will be made of any Sunday; weekday of Advent and Lent; weekday and Saturday of September Quarter Tense; Greater Litanies (25th April). The Sequence will be sung only on the feast of Corpus Christi. The Preface will be the Common Preface, unless there is a Preface proper to the season.

The votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament is excluded:—

a. on Sundays of I class
b. on Feasts of the I class
c. on Ash Wednesday and the first three days of Holy Week
d. on the vigils of Christmas and Pentecost
e. on days on which occurs a feast or commemoration of an identical mystery of our Lord.

On the above days except those enumerated in e., the Mass of the day is sung, with the rite and commemorations of a solemn votive Mass. The prayers of the impeded votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament are added to the prayers of the Mass of the day under the one conclusion. When the votive Mass is excluded because of identity of mystery, as mentioned above for solemn votive Masses, the Mass of the occurring feast or commemoration is sung without the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament, but with the rite of a solemn votive Mass, i.e., with Gloria, Creed and only the commemorations of a solemn votive Mass.

The Mass on the middle day of the prayer will be the Mass

pro pace (or some other Mass ordered by the Ordinary). Violet vestments are worn, the *Gloria* is omitted, but the Creed is sung. If the Mass is sung at the altar at which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, the second prayer of the Mass, under a separate conclusion, will be the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament. Other commemorations will be added as in the votive Mass of the first day. The votive Mass *pro pace* is excluded on the same days as the votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament, in which case the prayer of the Mass *pro pace* will always be added to prayer of the Mass of the day under the one conclusion. The Mass of the day will be sung with the rite of a solemn votive Mass.

In private Masses during the Forty Hours, the prayer of the Blessed Sacrament is added to the Mass, as the second prayer and under a separate conclusion, only when the Mass is being celebrated at the altar of Exposition.

THE NUPTIAL MASS.

The nuptial blessing may be given during Mass on any day during the year, except from the first Sunday of Advent to Christmas Day inclusive, and from Ash Wednesday until Easter Sunday inclusive, but even during these times the local Ordinary may, for a just cause, allow the blessing to be given. The votive Mass is celebrated in white vestments. The *Gloria* and Creed are omitted. The second (and third) prayers are the first (and second) prayers of the Office of the day. The Common Preface is said, unless there is a Preface of the season.

The votive Mass pro Sponsis is forbidden:—

a. on Sundays and holidays of obligation, even suppressed ones
b. on doubles of 1 and 2 class
c. on the vigil of Christmas and Pentecost
d. during the octaves of Easter and Pentecost
e. on all Souls' Day
f. on Ash Wednesday, and Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week
g. on Rogation days in churches in which the procession takes place and there is but one Mass, or whenever the obligation of the conventual Mass cannot be fulfilled by another priest.

On the above days, excepting All Souls' Day, the prayer of the votive Mass pro Sponsis is added to the prayer of the Mass of the day under the one conclusion, and the blessing is given during Mass as in the votive Mass.

PRIVATE VOTIVE MASSES.

Private votive Masses are those votive Masses that are not celebrated for some grave public cause with the consent of the Ordinary, but are chosen by the celebrant or the person who makes the offering.

When sung, these Masses are forbidden:—

a. on any Sunday
b. on any double feast
c. on Ash Wednesday and the Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week
d. on the vigils of Christmas and Pentecost
e. during the octaves of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost
f. on Rogation days, in churches in which there is a procession and only one Mass, or whenever the obligation of the conventual Mass cannot be fulfilled by another priest.

When private votive Masses are not sung, in addition to the above days on which the sung Mass is excluded, they are also forbidden:—

a. on weekdays of Quarter Tense
b. on weekdays of Advent from 17th to 23rd December inclusive
c. on weekdays from Ash Wednesday to the Wednesday of Holy Week inclusive
d. on Rogation Monday
e. on all vigils
f. on days from 2nd to 5th and 7th to 13th January
g. from Friday after the Ascension to Vigil of Pentecost inclusive.

A private votive Mass is of simple rite. The *Gloria* is not said, except in Masses of our Lady on Saturdays and in Masses of the Angels. The second prayer of the Mass is the prayer of the Office of the day. If the Office of the day has a second prayer, this becomes the third prayer of the votive Mass, otherwise the celebrant may add a third prayer of his own choice, but two prayers are sufficient. A sequence is never said, nor the Creed. The Preface is that proper to the Mass, otherwise the Preface of the season, or, in the absence of both, the Common Preface. The Last Gospel is always the gospel of St. John.

—P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

SACRIFICIAL RESPONSE TO THE MERCIES OF GOD.

During this year, 1956, we shall endeavour to quarry homilectically in some wonderfully practical pages of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans. Those pages are themselves really homiletic, that is, familiar and conversational in style, and they offer an abundance of materials for the homilist. It would indeed be difficult or impossible to find, outside of the Gospels, six or seven consecutive pages of Scripture presenting such a rich summary of Christian duties.

Moreover, the section which we have chosen, Romans XII, 1, to XV, 13, is unique in its contributions to the lectionary of the Roman Missal. Of the 71 verses comprised in it no less than 37 are used in the Sunday Epistles; and a further 5 verses form the Epistle of the Mass for a happy death. It is chiefly to the Sundays after the Epiphany (1-4) that these pericopae are allotted, but two of them (XIII, 11-14, and XV, 4-13) belong to the first and second Sundays of Advent. This code of Christian life from St. Paul's giant epistle is, therefore, of great liturgical and pastoral importance.

The section is a complete literary and doctrinal unit. It is not too long for our purpose—only just 1174 Greek words, including some paragraphs that can be treated satisfactorily through a few brief annotations. In particular, we can cover chapter XIV, a piece of 383 words, which is not used at all in the Sunday Liturgy of the Mass, with the brevity of a very succinct commentary. Its beautiful doctrine of tolerant charity towards Christians, whose convictions have not the strength of robust faith, can indeed be presented fairly well in a slightly commented paraphrase of St. Paul's own words.

Let us, then, have a look at the contents of the whole section and its divisions.

Every student of St. Paul will have noticed the great difference of style between his dogmatic expositions and his moral exhortations. In *Romans* the passage from the grand style to the familiar word of exhortation is very palpable. As Father Lagrange says in his fine commentary: [St. Paul passes to a sequence in which] the concatenation of the thoughts is not always very strict, and this defect of liaison appears even more in the construction of the phrases. They succeed each other according to varied rhythms, and one is not always sure

of the cut of the phrase. We should be inclined to say that Paul, having finished an important doctrinal exposition that was very difficult, now settles down to a familiar talk with the faithful of Rome—a talk less sustained by the laws of logic and order (presque à bâtons rompus).

The title of the whole section is easy to find. It is "Christian Conduct" or "The Duties of Christians". Having extolled the grace of Christ in one of the most magnificent eulogies of the redeeming mercy of God ever penned, the Apostle teaches the use of grace. This doctrine of the use of grace is evidently moral instruction. God lavishes his grace in order that those who receive it may live Christian lives. As Chrysostom says: "Having discoursed at great length on the love of God towards men, having shown God's ineffable concern for us and His unutterable, unfathomable goodness, he makes this same divine mercy the basis of his persuasion that those who have received such a benefit should lead lives worthy of the gift".

It is a sacrificial response to the mercy of God that St. Paul sets as the foundation of his instruction. Such self-immolation is an interior transformation attuning the believer to the will of God (XII, 1, 2).

As this same subjection to the will of God is a matter of humility and charity, these virtues occupy a foremost place. In fact they are the substance of the whole instruction, as may be seen from the headings of the subsections.

Each Christian finding, with humble modesty, his function in the body, which is the church (XII, 3-8) must practise fraternal charity, under the varied forms of Christian sympathy, towards all men, including enemies (9-21).

Humble obedience to civil authority fulfils debts of justice (XIII, 1-7); and the payment of the debt of charity to everybody is the fulfilment of the whole law (8-10). The passing of the night of the world and the continuous abbreviation of life lays an imperative urge on a Christian to be a child of light (11-14).

Mutual forbearance and the spirit of love and harmony are the points of exhortation in chapter XV already mentioned.

Self-denial and patience, welding unity of spirit between Jew and Gentile, are the lessons of the final subsection (XV, 1-13).

The Foundation, distended over only fifty Greek words, is so important that we shall devote the whole of this contribution to its essentially religious view of Christian morality. The whole moral life

of a Christian is basically religious. It is a continual response to God, an imitation or even a creature's lowly emulation of the Creator's goodness; consequently it is a continual effort to know God's will and live according to it. It is a consecration directing the whole of man's activity. The text says:

"I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercy of God, to offer your bodies as a sacrifice, living, holy, pleasing to God; for that is the worship reason requires of you. And do not model yourselves according to the fashion of this world around us, but transform yourselves by the renewal of the mind, so as to discern what is the will of God, that which is good, which is well-pleasing, which is perfect".

A substantially correct translation of a text is generally easy enough, but often the translator has to be content with one facet of the full meaning which the language of his author conveys, according to the inherent and adherent significations found in his vocabulary. The case arises with the very first word of our text. Should we translate "I beseech" or "I exhort"? The Vulgate "obsecro" invited us to choose the former, and it really seems the better sense. Apart from the fact that the Vulgate Latin is generally an excellent guide to the sense of the Greek New Testament, we have in the letter to Philemon an indication of the "auctoritas modesta" which St. Paul instrumented through the verb: *parakalō*. In his request to Philemon that the runaway slave Onesimus, should be taken back, the Apostle says: "Although I have much bold confidence in Christ to *command* you what is befitting, for charity sake I rather beseech...I beseech you for my son..." (Philemon 9, 10). St. Paul preferred to say: "I ask you" when, in the circumstances, the "asking" was really an authoritative exhortation.

The "therefore", which follows, is not a negligible word—nothing is negligible in the authentic text of the inspired Scriptures—it is a connecting link, not indeed with what immediately precedes but with the strong motivation which emerges from all the magnificent doctrinal expositions of Chapters I to XI. The weight of that motivation is emphasised in the phrase: "by the mercy of God", so that the sentence means: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, in view of the mercy of God, that is, in the name of that tremendous mercy". The exhortatory request is that all the Christians of Rome (called brethren) should offer their bodies "as a sacrifice, living, holy, pleasing to God".

The language is quite sacrificial but, of course, is metaphorical. The Romans are not asked to kill themselves, but to realize a spiritual

programme of religious, cultural self-dedication and self-immolation. The mind performs this priestly function and the body is the victim. "Your bodies" should not be translated "your persons" as in the Bible de Jerusalem. St. Paul means the body with its members or senses, just as he did when, under another metaphor, he exhorted the Romans "to offer their members as instruments of justice in the service of God" (6, 13).

Three adjectives describe the victim-body of this religious dedication: "living, holy, agreeable to God". Every animal victim is living, for it is the giving of the life of the victim that has significance. The animal at the altar of sacrifice was killed; in the "body-victim" there is also something that must be killed. We call the killing mortification. "Holiness" in the victim and "pleasingness" in the sight of God are to be taken according to the analogies of the unblemished and choice victims required in the Mosaic worship. Christian worship "in spirit and truth" requires that these material qualities be spiritualised. While the concupiscences of the body are falling under the knife of mortification, the life that is offered to God is that of faith and charity: "The physical life that I live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and sacrificed himself for me" (Gal. 2:20).

"Holiness", as a sacrificial response to the holiness of God, is secured by that attitude which we call consecration, devotion—call it by any other name that signifies total dedication to the divine service.

"Well-pleasingness"—a capital idea in the spiritual doctrine of St. Paul—is that quality which makes the sacrifice "an odour of sweetness". St. Thomas very practically and very wisely says that it is a matter of right intention—*Deo placentem,* scilicet per rectitudinem intentionis.

A few words from Chrysostom, before we pass on: "How is the body, one may say, to become a sacrifice? Let the eye look at nothing evil, and it has become a sacrifice. Let the tongue speak nothing unseemly, and it has become an oblation. Let the hand do nothing wrong, and it has become a holocaust. Rather, this is not enough; we must have good works also. Let the hand give alms, let the mouth bless those that speak ill of us, let the hearing be constantly applied to readings of Scripture" (Hom. XX in Ep. ad Romanos).

"That is the worship reason requires of you." Again, there is question of getting the precise meaning of a word. The offering which St. Paul wishes to be made to God is called a *logikē latreia.* "Latreia" is undoubtedly religious service offered to God and, in the present con-

text, a sacrificial service metaphorically so called. The meaning of *logikos* is not so clear. The Vulgate translates it *rationabilis,* and we find spiritual writers using this rendering to inculcate the lesson that the sacrificial mortification of the body should not be unreasonable, not excessively severe, but *cum discretione.* The idea is quite sound and good but does not belong to St. Paul's present subject. St. Chrysostom, who is followed by most moderns understands *logikos* as equivalent to "spiritual"—your spiritual worship. This would imply a contrast to the sacrifices of Jewish worship, but it seems doubtful that the Apostle intends such a contract. After all the Vulgate "rationabilis, reasonable" seems to be the best translation, if we understand it in the sense of a worship worthy of God and man. The nuance, however, is slight enough, for this would be a spiritual worship such as even Psalmists and Prophets preached in the days when animal sacrifices were offered: "Offer to God a sacrifice of praise, and pay your vows to the Most High" (Ps. 49:11), and again: "My sacrifice, o God, is a contrite spirit: a heart broken and humbled, O Lord thou wilt not despise" (Ps. 50:19).

The concrete applications of the programme of immolating the senses are almost unlimited, and, in our day, when so many types of sensational advertisement and so many appeals of sensual allurement are constantly offered to our senses, an instructor should not omit recommending self-examination on the use of the five senses. The cultivation of an interior life requires strong censure of our yieldings to sense-attraction. That self-examinatory method of prayer which St. Ignatius recommends in the Book of Exercises and which St. Francis Xavier used to enjoin on his penitents in India includes not only the Ten Commandments and the Seven Capital Vices, but also the Powers of the Soul and the Five Corporal Senses. If we want models, we shall easily find them in Saints like Augustine, whose self-examination on the senses in the tenth book of the Confessions should be studied, or like St. Thérèse of Lisieux, whose scrutiny of the history of her coroporal senses in preparatino for Extreme Unction shows how delicately souls who seek perfection weigh and estimate little things.

"Do not model yourselves according to the fashion of this world". We have avoided the translation "Be not conformed to this world", for St. Paul marks the superficiality, changeableness and fleetingness of the attractions of the world by using a verb compounded not of *morphe,* "form", but of *schema,* "figure" or "fashion". The Apostle's meaning may be well illustrated by a passage on the passing world in first

Corinthians (7:29-31): "This I say, brethren, the allotted time has become very short. From now on those who have wives should be as if they had not, those who weep as if they were not weeping, and those who rejoice as if they were not rejoicing, and those who buy as if they did not possess [what they buy], and those who use this world, as if they did not really use it, because the fashion (stage-setting) of this world is passing away". Nothing in all the appearances of this world should prevail on a Christian to *stick* in it, for the vocation of a Christian is heavenward. It is the impermanence of the passing face of the world that are considered in the paragraph just quoted, but in our text of *Romans,* the bad influences reigning in the world, influences which can pervert the mind of a Christian, are also under consideration. The grace of Christ gives a taste, a relish, an appetite for the things of eternity. It inspires the desire of living, within the possibilities of our human powers and circumstances, an angelic life. The fascination of the world's trifles and of its bad pleasures can vitiate that taste for higher things and abscure our judgment on values.

In order then to place us in these right dispositions and set our lives in this direction, the Apostle tells the Romans to "transform themselves by the renewal of the mind, so as to discern what is the will of God, that which is good, which is well-pleasing, which is perfect". This is no extra-mundane ideal of perfection. The present imperative: "Keep transforming yourselves" shows that the task is not accomplished in a day. The renewal of the mind, as a principle of sane judgment, is, of course, the work of the Holy Spirit with our co-operation. St. Paul had already made that clear in the body of the Epistle (8: 9 ff). As Father Lyonnet notes (Bible de Jerusalem in h.l.): "The human mind once it is renewed by the life of the Divine Spirit becomes capable of discerning, as it were, by connaturality, the will of God of which the most perfect expression is the mystery of love in view of the salvation of men and the glory of the Father". This interior law written in the heart by the Spirit of God is the primary law of a Christian. Its light does not annul, but confirms the light of positive law, and its operation, however instinctive and experimental it is, remains subject to the guidance of the hierarchical Church.

The progress which can and should be made in the discernment and approving love of the divine will is indicated by the grading of objects: good, well-pleasing, perfect.

St. Thomas Aquinas on this last phrase: "so as to discern what is

the will of God", has the following luminous comment: "Here we should consider that, as a man who has a vitiated sense of taste, does not possess right judgment on the savour of things, but sometimes abhors what is sweet, and likes what really has an abominable taste, while on the contrary he who has a healthy taste possesses right judgment on the savour of things, so similarly a man who has a corrupt affection, or inclination turned towards secular things, does not have right judgment on what is good, while the man with right and sound affections or inclinations, with a sense renewed through grace, judges rightly what is good".

The soul under the grace of the Holy Spirit is, as it were, the priest of this sacrificial response to the tremendous mercies of God, but the body as victim in the great Christian obedience unto death is an essential in the work of human sanctification. The highest form of the response is, of course, martyrdom, and multitudes are making that response in various countries to-day. It is not, however, only the glowing desire of martyrdom, such as we meet in the letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch that is counted sacrifice, but the discipline which keeps the body a servant, and the zeal with which so many laboriously, painfully, perseveringly dedicate the energies of their bodies in work and fatigue and sickness to the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

W. LEONARD.

Notes

NOTES ON ARCHBISHOP REYNOLDS

Son of Patrick and Elizabeth Reynolds—nee Bourke—, Christopher Reynolds, the future Bishop of Adelaide and its first Archbishop, was born in Dublin on 11th July, 1834. His education, like that of the ordinary Irish boy, must have begun at an early age, but on this point the Benedictine Records of New Norcia, from which I am writing this note, up to the time of Reynold's election to the see of Adelaide, shed no light. One thing is clearly stated in an early Diary, that Dr. Salvado, O.S.B., second Bishop of Port Victoria, in the Northern Territory, was in Ireland in 1852 seeking recruits for his distant mission, and that young Christopher, together with his young friend Frederick Byrne, accepted Salvado's invitation for that mission which was to be exclusively a Benedictine one. The two friends, who had also expressed their vocation for the Benedictine Order, were first of all sent by the Bishop to Subiaco, in Italy, where they were received as postulants in 1853, and then as novices in the following year.

The life of the cloister, we are told, agreed with them; not so the Italian weather impairing especially Christopher's health. He was the weaker of the two. He was also the younger by five months. Hoping for a better climate in the antipodes, and leaving their noviciate unfinished but with the idea of re-entering it in Australia, they joined Serra's party for the 'Swan River', as West Australia was then called. No other course was left them, the Home Government having abandoned, for reasons of insalubrity, the Port Victoria Settlement and Dr. Salvado having virtually remained a Bishop without a Diocese. He returned to his beloved New Norcia whose father and founder he was, and never once visited his distant see. All this notwithstanding, Christopher Reynolds ever felt that the Northern Territory was his first love and Salvado his Bishop. Dr. Serra and his party followed two years later. They landed at Fremantle on 25th May, 1855, not 1853, as Cardinal Moran writes in his voluminous "History of the Catholic Church in Australasia". Reynolds' landing with Serra's party marks his entrance into the Australian scene and the beginning of his missionary life in the Benedictine Mission of West Australia.

Dr. Serra was enjoying for the time being an immense spiritual jurisdiction, being the monastic superior of the monks in West Aus-

tralia as well as the Bishop Administrator of the diocese of Perth. He had opened the New Norcia noviciate at the Subiaco near Perth, and to this solitude by Monger's Lake were directed the two young Irishmen. There they divided their time between prayer and work, pursued the study of the Holy Rule and, probably, took lessons in philosophy and theology from Dr. Serra, himself a scholar, whenever he came to Subiaco for a rest from episcopal cares. But their appetite for the Benedictine spirit was merely whetted, as a relapse into illness and the rough and unfinished condition of the monks quarters at Subiaco, forced them to give up their vocation while still waiting to re-enter the noviciate. That they did not receive the habit again is more than probable. After lingering for a while teaching in the Catholic schools of Perth and Fremantle, they definitely left the Benedictine Mission on the 25th January, 1857, with the intention of going to Bishop Murphy in Adelaide.

Evidently, this was what they had planned if we judge from the short sketch, "History of the Catholic Church in South Australia", by F. Byrne himself. He writes: "The Bishop was aware of their coming and received them kindly". Byrne informs us, moreover, that he and his companion set sail from Fremantle in a private schooner, 'The Perseverance', and on the 28th January, and that, after an eventful voyage of thirty-six days, they reached Adelaide on the 6th of March. "After a few days in Adelaide", Byrne goes on to say, "the Bishop sent Mr. Byrne to Sevenhill College to finish his ecclesiastical studies and kept Mr. Reynolds in Adelaide for some time, as he was delicate". At the time of Bishop Murphy's death, April, 1858, Reynolds was one of the two students at Sevenhill, and we may suppose that he continued there until he was promoted to the priesthood by Bishop Geoghegan.

And now we come upon Reynolds' new field of labour—the Adelaide Mission. With his labours as a priest in this vineyard of the Lord, we are meagerly acquainted. Fragmentary evidence in our records shows him not at all dissatisfied in this "large but neglected vineyard", meeting as well as he could the wants of Adelaide and later, in 1871, those of Gawler, celebrating two Masses and preaching twice on a Sunday with the addition of sick calls and hospital duties. In one way and another, he carried on the same work under the same difficulties as an Administrator and as a Bishop, always happy but in indifferent health. Reynolds suffered from some kind of chronic sickness and one that gave him at times great pain in the discharge of his ecclesiastical duties—which goes to prove that the change of climate

seems not to have had the expected good results. The following epistolary fragment from a letter of Father Byrne to Canon Martelli, O.S.B., of Fremantle, speaks volumes of the difficulties of the Adelaide Mission, and, consequently, of the burden that must have been thrown on the shoulders of young Father Reynolds by the appalling dearth of priests, on the certainty that he was one of the efficient priests in the diocese.

"Adelaide, February 25th, 1865.

My dear Fr. Martelli,

....You are greatly out in your guess at our Catholic population. That of all denominations is now estimated at 50,000, of whom we are the ½ which brings our number up to 21,428 who are scattered over the largest of the Australian colonies, and to attend to whose spiritual wants we have 17 priests, not counting four Jesuit Fathers.

So much for the priests. Now, as to the other spiritual helps for our people, we are entirely destitute of any;—no nuns to instruct the girls, to visit hospitals and prisons, etc., no Christian Brothers and, I may say, no schools. This is a sad picture, but it is not exaggerated, and it almost could not be otherwise, for we are without a Bishop, I may say, these eight years, as Dr. Geoghegan took no interest in the place; in fact, he knew of abuses which he was either afraid or unwilling to correct...."

In a letter dated at Gawler, April 24th, 1871, Father Reynolds speaks of Dr. Shiel's

"very poor health since his arrival, unable to do any active duty, yet in no pain, but seems utterly prostrate. He left in Easter Week for Melbourne and the change of air seems not to have had the desired effect, at least up to this date. He takes the death of dear Dr. Smyth, V.G., to heart very much; indeed, it's a great loss to this Mission."

Reynolds was appointed Administrator in Dr. Shiel's declining days and he continued in office, carrying the "heavy burden" which he was looking forward to be relieved of, until the heavier one of the Adelaide Bishopric fell to his sorrow upon his shoulders.

From the first days of his Administratorship, the 'solicitudo ecclesiarum' is foremost in his mind. It supplies him with the theme in almost all of his ten letters in our possession, the needs of his impoverished diocese especially the pressing ones of the Northern Territory Mission recurring here and there like the thematic current in a musical composition. Reynolds had at all times felt the deepest interest in the future of the Northern Territory. It was his "first love" and, like every first love is sure of taking root in the heart and of being acted upon, it now re-appears and grows northwards following his sheep along the new telegraph line to Darwin, and seeking them in the newly discovered gold fields. Indeed, a new field of action unfolds itself before his eyes and he stood to the occasion desiring at least to do his best. Wrote he to Bishop Salvado:—

"Adelaide, West Terrace,
May 20th, 1873.

My Lord,

After too long a silence on my part, I must now trouble your Lordship to solve a doubt and to supply a want supposed to exist.

The numbers that have left South Australia for our Northern Territory has assumed a formidable body, and several want to have their children born there baptized, several marriages to be blessed and the Sacraments be administered to very many, if not all. They are crying out for the visit of a priest. Circumstances permit one of us visiting them, but the doubt has now arisen that tho' under our Colony, it is not under the jurisdiction of this diocese; that it belongs to your Lordship, being within the limits of territory assigned to the diocese of Port Victoria. I cannot decide on this matter not knowing the boundaries of the diocese of Port Victoria, and the Bulls of the late Bishop throw no light on the matter, for the Northern Territory was not belonging formally to South Australia, when I was appointed to Adelaide.

I would beg your Lordship to settle the question in the 1st place, and 2nd, if within your jurisdiction, to grant all faculties to the priest about to visit that place, as matters are now so far prepared. We have, as your Lordship may be aware, telegraphic communication with the priest by the line your Lordship's reply comes. I believe that the Archdiocese of Sydney thinks it belongs to Brisbane, but I give this as *rumours only*.

I beg, then, my Lord, the favour of an early reply as your word will settle all doubt in the affair.

I would have written during the past year, but the troubles of this hapless diocese would, as a matter of course, be the theme, and, I assure your Lordship, it's anything but pleasant for me to relate or recall such sad events.

We know nothing as yet of our future Bishop. In my last letter from Rome, March 5th, no appointment had then been made. I must beg your Lordship to inform dear Fr. Martelli that owing to press of duty and my convalescence, I shall be obliged to forego the pleasure of writing to him by this mail, but next month, D.V., I shall not fail to make up for my delay.

I trust your Lordship enjoys good health and peace, which is second only to health.

With kindest regards to all my old friends, I beg to subscribe myself Your Lordship's

Affectionate son in Xsto,
C. A. Reynolds."

It was an easy matter for Bishop Salvado to give exactly, as he did, the original boundaries of the Port Victoria Diocese, afterwards of Palmerston by the suggestion of Cardinal Moran—"The sea in the North, the 25th parallel of latitude in the South, the 129th line of longitude in the West and the 140th in the East". Bishop Salvado had been haunted since his consecration, in 1849, by visions of his abandoned diocese. But now, in the light of Reynold's letter, he saw a new star of hope hovering over Palmerston. He not only granted Reynold's request. He appointed him, moreover, his Vicar General with all the onerous duties that were attached to the office. After asking him for a faithful report of how matters stood up North, and after reminding him, or the priest he meant to send to that portion, of the duty of starting a Baptismal, Marriage and Burial Register, the Bishop closes thus:—

"It would be a good thing if you could select at Palmerston, or thereabouts, several blocks of land as sites for a Catholic church, school room, dwelling house and cemetery...I do hereby authorise you not only for that purpose, but for every other ecclesiastical matter, begging you *to do my part* and to be my *alter ego,* for which I would be very thankful to you."

Reynolds chose, "for many reasons", as his envoy Father Woods —no doubt Julian Tenison—, and to the many Catholics, when leaving for the different works at Darwin, he gave out several "useful and religious books". "Most of these Catholics, I am told", he continues, "meet at least fortnightly for recitation of Rosary and Catechism and take away a book. A protestant gentleman told me this mode of acting (as he called it), kept them from public houses, news room and, of course, with good results".

Administrator Reynolds, no matter how great his interest in the future of the Northern Territory Mission, seems to have been unable to put the subdelegated faculties to use. For the moment, his election to the See of Adelaide wholly absorbed his mind, although the success of the Northern venture must have depended on Father Woods. Whether the intended visit took place or not Salvado never knew. Reynolds remained silent for four years, and his subsequent letters after that period are silent about the ministration of a priest. This is a very important point which must be made clear, as far as it affects Reynolds' character, in the light of the following passage in one of his letters to Dr. Salvado dated January 30th, 1874:—

"....I am very glad to have the 'relativi termini' as they throw a great deal of light on many matters which heretofore were quite obscure. The subdelegation of faculties, etc., I hope to be able to put to use ere long. Fr. Woods, who is now in Sydney, has quite recovered his tertian ague, and told me in his last letter that he only awaits the "rainy season being over" when he will prepare for the Northern Territory visit..."

In point of fact nothing was done until the arrival in Palmerston, 24th September, 1882, of Father Strele, S.J., as Superior of the Jesuit Mission there and as the second Vicar General of his Lordship Bishop Salvado.

To return to Reynold's episcopal election:—

"West Terrace,
August 12th, 1873.

My Dear Lord,

Your very welcome letters were duly received by me, and steps taken to forward to Fr. Woods (who is on a Missionary visit to Rockhampton, 300 miles North of Brisbane) all faculties, as I wished him for many reasons to visit that portion of our South Australian dependency. I will not enter into other particulars, nor send you the maps of the different surveys of Northern Territory as I expect, *fully* expect to see your Lordship in Adelaide in a *short time,* when I will be able to say in a few hours more than could be transacted in a hundred letters.

Probably you are aware of the action of the Holy See regarding this Diocese. If not, I beg to inform you, my dear Lord, that last mail brought a notification to me and another to the Archbishop of Sydney that your humble servant was appointed by the Holy Father to the See of Adelaide.

I was thunderstruck at the intelligence, for I was looking out each mail to be relieved from the heavy burden of the Administratorship, when now a Mandate comes to bind me irrevocably to the sorrows and cares of this poor afflicted Diocese for the remainder of my days. Now, my Lord, you know that through you I came to Australia. I may say you were the beginning; so, now come to Adelaide for my consecration, first for my sake—for I claim a son's right that my *Father* should take part in this event the greatest of my life. Secondly, you will meet the Ven. Metropolitan who has kindly promised to come to Adelaide for the occasion *instead* of my going to Sydney. Thirdly, you will meet the Bps. of Maitland and Bathurst who are most anxious to see you, as a Meeting of Bps. will be held shortly after Easter. I expect the Bishop of Hobartown will also come, and probably the Bps. of Brisbane and Armidale.

Now, I earnestly beg you will not deny me this little consolation that you, my dear Lord, should be *one* of Assistants to the Archbishop, so that as Providence did not ordain that I should be a Benedictine monk, at least my desires for such a life may have the consolation of *two* sons of St. Benedict at my consecration.

I have before me a letter of your Lordship to a former Bp. of Adelaide (Dr. Geoghegan), who asked you to go to Melbourne for his consecration; but, my Lord, he might be refused. He had no claim on you, besides the distance was much greater and mode of travelling more difficult than now. I have a claim on my former Bishop, my father and my friend.

The Bulls are expected next mail, and the consecration will take place about the end of October or the Feast of All Saints. So, don't fail, you have sufficient time; and how glad Fred and I shall be to see you. If possible bring Father Martelli with you.

There is one little matter more yet, I must confess, I approach it with some delicacy. I know, my Lord, you are not overburdened with money and perhaps might reasonably be deterred from the cost of journey. I will pay all expenses, but don't be angry with me, my dear Lord, for so bluntly mentioning this. So anxious am I about your coming that I will leave no means untried to induce you to come. I again earnestly beg you not to disappoint me.

I will not say more at present but reserve all till I have the happiness of seeing you, and meanwhile earnestly begging your Lordship's prayers—also those of the Community, many of whom, I dare say, remember me.

I remain, my dear Lord,
Your affectionate son in Xsto.
C. A. Reynolds,
Bishop Elect of Adelaide".

Because of the date of the Sydney Synod, which could not fit in with his arrangements, and which, according to our records, was cancelled after all, Bishop Salvado had to forego the pleasure of attending his friend's consecration. He sent him his hearty congratulations, but "commiseration", he was told by the recipient of the honour, would have been a more appropriate word.

DOM XIMENES, O.S.B.

The English word 'propitiation' corresponds in meaning almost exactly with the late Latin 'propitiatio'. The adjective, however, from which the latter is derived is a good classical word 'propitius', which seems to have had through its known history a predominately religious turn. Thus, in an old prayer formula we read: 'Mars pater, te precor quaesoque, ut sies volens propitius mihi domo familiaeque nostrae'.[1] 'Propitius', then, which originally meant 'being near' (prope) in a physical sense, comes to mean 'being near' in a religious sense, much as the Virgilian 'praesens' in 'Tu dea, tu praesens, nostro succurre labori'.[2]

PROPITIATION IN THE SACRIFICE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

While the Latin 'propitius' and the now rather secularized English 'propitious' denote merely a favourable, kindly state of mind in the person thus described, the verb 'propitiate' (propitiare) means more than merely 'make favourable'; it connotes a transit from the opposite state, that of hostility, of enmity, to one of favouring, of blessing. You would not propitiate a Roman god merely by making him change from an attitude of neutrality to one of favour. No, the note of *appeasement* is essential to the verb and noun forms. In the mind of an ancient pagan, 'propitiatio placatio est'.[3]

A Christian can use the term 'propitious' of God without any reserves, but 'propitiation' contains an anthropomorphic element, which cannot be permitted to dominate our concept. When we 'propitiate' God, when we offer, for example, a sacrifice of 'propitiation', we, as it were, act upon God, we are the cause by which He is changed from being hostile towards us to being favourably disposed. This, of course, is a human mode of speech which can be understood. We read in Gen. 6:6: 'And it repented Yahweh that he had made man on the earth'. Similar expressions which seem to imply a *change* in God are often found too in the Liturgy: 'Deus, qui culpa offenderis, paenitentia placaris...' Such use of language is permitted, or rather demanded, if we are to speak of God in any but the most precise philosophical terminology. When we say that we 'propitiate' God, we know that it is ourselves we change, not God, and we know that it is God, even more than we, who produces the change in us. 'Propitiation' of God, in effect, means our purification, the remission of our sins.

So there is no question whether it is legitimate or not to use such

---

[1] Cato, *De Re Rustica*, 141:2.
[2] *Aeneid*, 9:404.
[3] Isidorus, *Origines*, 15:4.

words as 'propitiate' or 'propitiation' of God. The matter to be discussed here is merely one of *fact*. Is this notion of 'propitiating' God intrinsic to the ritual of sacrifice for sin of the Old Testament? It is, of course, obvious that the idea of appeasing God's anger (often expressed by the Hebrew *hillāh*) constantly appears in the non-ritual contexts of the Old Testament. With this usage, in itself, we are not concerned; it is a mode of expression common to all religious. What interests us is the mentality, proper to the Old Testament, behind the Jewish *rite and sacrifice of expiation*. The conclusions we reach will be important for the proper understanding of the religious outlook of the Old Law, and will have inevitable repercussions on our appreciation of the central sacrifice of the New Law.[4]

To approach the New Testament with a background which does not go beyond the Graeco-Roman world of ideas is to invite misunderstanding. Here, as in similar cases, we must 'search the Scriptures'.

---

[4]Thus the meaning of Rom. 3:23-26 is largely bound up with the word *hilastērion*, which is translated by the Vulgate 'propitiatio'. When St. Paul speaks of Christ as a 'propitiation', does he mean that Christ by His redemptive work appeased the anger of the Father? If this is so, then the 'justice' of v. 26, shown by God in the redemption, is some form of vindictive justice, justice that demands appeasement, propitiation. Only a superficial reading of the passage would fail to note the tension set up between this interpretation and the normal Pauline concept of the 'justice of God', namely that justice by which God is faithful to His promises of salvation. Actually, the majority of modern commentators, both Catholic and Protestant, end up by accepting some modification of the 'justice of God' found elsewhere in St. Paul. They feel themselves forced to this by the context. For the opposite and far more probable view, Fr. Lyonnet's excellent treatment, put forward in three articles in *Verbum Domini*, 1947; *De Iustitia Dei in Epistola ad Rom.*

To avoid misunderstanding, the writer wishes to note emphatically (it should be clear enough from the scope of the essay) that he is *not* dealing with the meaning of the word 'propitiatio' or related terms as they appear in the documents of the Church. The Church is not bound to use words always in their Scriptural meaning. Thus, for example, the Council of Trent speaks of the sacrifice of the Mass as being 'vere propitiatorium' and seemingly explains this term by the following sentence: "per ipsumque fieri, ut...misercordiam consequamur..." Here, the effect is regarded as being in *us*. Yet the following sentence begins: 'Huius quippe oblatione *placatus* Dominus...' (DB 940). Clearly the use of 'propitiatorium' is a wide one, and it remains so in the doctrinally important summary (canon 3, DB 950). Here, 'propitiatorium' is defined by its opposites: it excludes a sacrifice which is merely of praise or thanksgiving, and it excludes a mere commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross. Similarly, in the encyclical of the present Holy Father, *Mediator Dei*, propitiation is mentioned side by side with expiation and reconciliation as the third end of the Mass (par. 77, C.T.S., England). Expiation has for its term the sins of men, reconciliation affects the sinner himself, propitiation seems here to have God for its term. This use of the word, though not that of the O.T. Vulgate, is, as we have seen, perfectly legitimate.

The Scriptures are primarily the original texts which came from the hand of the inspired writer. It is to these that Pius XII sends us in his Encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu.* In fact, according to the Holy Father, a biblical scholar who neglects the study of the original texts 'could in no wise escape the stigma of levity and sloth'.[5]

HEBREW: *KIPPER.*

Let us begin with an examination of the Hebrew verb *kipper,* which, being above all the word used to describe the function of sacrifice for sin, is quite fundamental to our discussion. Its original meaning, according to the standard Hebrew-English Dictionary of Brown, Driver, and Briggs, is dubious; they suggest 'cover', and refer to a cognate Arabic verb *kapara.* Unfortunately, in explaining the development of this word's use as a religious term, they insist on the idea of 'covering over' sin, an idea which Protestant theologians have long regarded as fundamental to their theory of the remission of sins.

This interpretation is very much open to criticism. Quite apart from any theological views, quite apart from any theoretical discussion about the remission of sins, the weight of evidence shows that *kipper,* in its actual religious usage, and probably too in its derivation,[6] means 'remit', 'wipe away', 'expiate'.

Actually, a very good case can be made for deriving *kipper* from the Babylonian *kuppuru,* a word employed in the description of the New Year ritual, in which the temple was purified (rubbed, *kuppuru*) by the body of a slaughtered sheep.[7]

However, whatever the derivation of the word, it is important for our present enquiry to note that *kipper,* in its ritual meaning, *never* expresses or implies an appeasement or a placation of God. This is above all clear in the rite of the great day of expiation, the ceremonies of which are described in Lev. 16:1-34, and where the word occurs fifteen times. All is summed up in v. 30: 'On that day he (the priest)

---

[5] *A.A.S.,* 1943, p. 307.

[6] Herrmann, *Theologisches Wörtchuch zum N.T.,* article *hilaskomai,* p. 304. This great work, produced by the scholars of the German Evangelical Protestant Church, is indispensable for anyone who wishes to follow modern Biblical research. For an appreciation by Catholic scholars, the reader is referred to a review of the latest articles of the *Wörterbuch* in the *Revue Biblique,* Oct., 1954, p. 621-624. Cf. also Zorell, *Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum V.T., kpr*; also Moraldi, *Sensus Vocis hilastērion in R* 3:25, in *Verbum Domini,* 1948, p. 266...

[7] In this strange rite, the king was stripped by the high priest of his royal insignia, and then very roughly handled: his ears were pulled and his face struck. He was made to kneel and to confess his guilt. Again he was struck by the high priest until his tears flowed. The appearance of tears was a sign that the god Bel was well disposed.

shall make expiation (*yᵉkappēr*) for you, to cleanse you; from all your sins will you be clean before Yahweh'. Again in v. 34 we read: 'And this shall be for you an everlasting rule, to make expiation for all (literally 'from all', *mikkol*) the sins of Israel once a year'.

In these and similar passages the subject is generally the officiating priest, sometimes God (Deut. 32:43), but God is *never* found as the object. He is not regarded as *acted upon* by the rite of expiation, but the term of His or His priest's action is always the sins of men or the uncleanness connected with sin.

It will be useful to consider for a moment the non-ritual uses of the same verb. Here God is normally the subject, the object being the sins of men. Let this example serve for many others: 'He in his mercy remits sin (*yᵉkappēr 'āwōn*) and does not destroy'.[8] When God is not the subject, we have still no clear evidence for the meaning of 'placate'. One must admit a certain obscurity in some cases. In Ex. 32:30, Herrman[9] sees in *'akapperāh* the meaning associated with the noun *kōpcr,* and would translate, 'I shall make recompense'.[10] Moses is ready to pay with his life for the sin of the people (v. 32). Others prefer the more normal meaning of 'obtain pardon for sin'.[11] In any case Moffat's translation, 'perhaps I can appease him', is hard to justify.

In two non-religious contexts *kipper* does seem clearly to have the meaning of 'placate', and in both cases it is a question of placating men. In the first (Gen. 32:21), Jacob hopes to appease (*'akapperāh*) Esau by his gifts. In the second (Prov. 16:14) the wise man will pacify the wrath of the king (*yᵉkapperennah*). The underlying idea in such examples is probably that of soothing an angry person by caressing rather than by covering his face.[12]

Thus the religious meaning of *kipper* in the Old Testament is constant. In the non-ritual as well as in the ritual contexts, it expresses the wiping away, cancellation, remission of uncleanness and sin.

KAPPORET.

We read in Ex. 25:17-22 the instructions for the making of a slab

---

[8]Ps. 78:38.

[9]Op. cit., p. 304.

[10]*Kōper* is a legal term meaning 'ransom', 'fine', 'compensation'. It is used of the sum which must be paid to an injured party, especially when the life of the offender is forfeit. In some cases, too, the compensation is regarded as paid to God. This, however, is accidental, and remains within the *legal* sphere, and does not affect the fundamental *religious* meaning of *kipper.*

[11]Moraldi, op. cit., p. 267.

[12]Cf. Zorell, op. cit.

of pure gold (the *kappōret,* a substantive derived from *kipper*), to be set above the ark of the covenant and to be adorned at either end with two gold cherubim, whose wings were outstretched over it. This was to be the seat of Yahweh, from which He would speak to Moses (Num 7:89); this was the centre of the impressive ritual of the great feast of expiation, being incensed (Lev. 16:13) and then sprinkled with the blood of the victim (v. 15). Here Yahweh sat enthroned above the cherubim (1 Sam. 4:4; 2 Sam. 6:2; Ps. 80:2). So important was this golden throne that the Holy of Holies was called its house (*bêt hakkappōret*).

It should be clear from our discussion of *kipper* and from the function of this golden throne, that we have in the *kappōret* a place for remission of sins, or a means of remission of sins. Those who translate it by 'cover' (as Moffat), base their version either on the meaning they assign to *kipper* ('to cover' sins), or else on the function of 'cover' to the ark of the covenant which they ascribe to the golden slab. Both reasons are quite inadequate. The former has been already rejected. The second very much underrates the importance of *kappōret.* It was, as we have seen, no mere cover of the ark, but the very centre of the rite of expiation and the most holy object in the Holy of Holies.[13]

SEPTUAGINT RENDERINGS.

For an understanding of New Testament Greek and of the Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament in the Greek speaking world in the last centuries before the coming of Christ, a knowledge of the technical religious vocabulary of the Septuagint is all but essential. Not only were the ideas of the New Testament writers permeated with the mentality of the Old Law, but their very choice of words was largely influenced by the actual text they used and commonly quoted from, namely, the Alexandrian Greek translation we call the Septuagint.

When we come to the expressions used in the Septuagint to translate *kipper* and *kappōret,* we seem, at first sight, to find opposition to the conclusions established above. The fact is, that in the majority of cases it is by the Greek *hilaskomai* and its derivatives that the Hebrew words are rendered.

Now, from Homer onwards, this verb is nearly always used with the meaning of 'placate'. Actually in Homer it is *always* used of

[13]Of the current English translations the least inadequate seems to be that of the Revised Version, 'mercy seat'. The Douay 'propitiatory' is a literal translation of the Vulgate, which can easily be misunderstood by those who are not acquainted with the background of the Vulgate rendering.

placating the gods.[14] Only very rarely is *exilaskomai* used with the meaning of 'cancel', 'expiate'.[15] This concept of appeasing the somewhat irrational whims of various deities dominated the religion of the Graeco-Roman world. One is deminded of the altar to the unknown god which St. Paul used as a start for his famous sermon at Athens.

Must we then reverse our conclusions about *kipper,* or at least admit that in translating the word and its derivatives the Greek writers profoundly modified the concept of 'remission of sins', making of it an 'appeasement of God'?

This query is given a very satisfactory answer in C. H. Dodd's masterly work, *The Bible and the Greeks.*[16] It is true that in the Septuagint renderings *kipper* and its derivatives are normally translated by *exilaskomai* and various related substantives.[17] But before we examine the usage of these words, it will be enlightening to see what other Greek verbs are employed from time to time to render the same Hebrew *kipper.* We find among others *apaleiphō* (wipe away),[18] *katharizō* (purify),[19] *hagiazein* (make holy),[20] *athōioō* (pronounce guiltless).[21]

We are thus prepared to discover that *hilaskomai* and its compounds, contrary to classical usage, have a meaning similar to the verbs cited above. Here it is interesting to note what other Hebrew verbs, besides *kipper,* are translated by this same Greek verb. Among these we find *hittēh* (cleanse from sin),[22] *sālah* (forgive),[23] *nāsā'* (remove iniquity),[24] *niham* (have compassion).[25]

In the few examples in which *exilaskomai* seems to mean 'placate', there is, as Dodd points out, a special context. It is said either of pagans who are accustomed to appease their gods and so behave towards

---

[14]As in *Iliad,* 1:427: *'molpēi theon hilaskonto'.*

[15]Cf. *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament,* Moulton and Milligan, *hilaskesthai.*

[16]This work is typical of so many valuable Biblical studies published in recent times by non-Catholics in England. It has a particularly enlightening chapter on 'Atonement', p. 82-95. Cf. also Büchsel, in *Theol. Wörterb. zum N.T.,* article *hilaskomai.*

[17]*hilasmos, exilasmos, exilasis, exilasma.*

[18]Dan. 9:24.

[19]Ex. 29:37; 30:10; cf. Deut. 32:43; Is. 47:11.

[20]Ex. 29:33, 36.

[21]Jer. 18:23.

[22]Common in 2 Par. and Ez.

[23]In middle, with God as subject, 4 Kings 5:18; Ps. 24:11; 2 Par. 6:30. In passive, with God as subject, 4 Kings 24:4, etc.

[24]In middle, Ecclus. 16:7.

[25]In passive, Ex. 32:14.

Yahweh, or the tone of the context is contemptuous. In all cases, the verb translated is the Hebrew *hillāh*.[26]

We have now viewed, on the one hand, the various Greek renderings of *kipper*, and, on the other, the various Hebrew verbs which *hilaskomai* and its compounds translate. It should be abundantly clear that this Greek verb, as used in the Septuagint, has no connotation of 'appeasing' or 'placating', except in the special cases noted above. This conclusion is confirmed and strengthened when we consider the cases where verbs of the *hilaskomai* class are used to translate *kipper* and its derivatives.

The Greek verb is commonly used in the middle. In this form, it can take a direct object with the meaning 'purify', 'cancel'; or it can take an indirect object introduced by *epi, peri, hyper*, which correspond to the Hebrew *'al, be'ad*. There is never question of 'appeasing' God. The passive use of the same verb scarcely differs from that of the middle. When God is the subject, it means 'have mercy on', 'forgive'.

HILASTERION.

The normal Greek translation of *kappōret* is *hilastērion*. Clearly the Greek translation saw in the sacred object already discussed something to be described by its function in the Jewish sacrificial rite. The Greek noun is the neuter of the adjective *hilastērios*, itself derived from *hilaskomai*, and can only mean, given the Septuagint background of the verb, 'that which cancels sin, expiates'. This use of the Greek term gives valuable confirmation of our earlier conclusions about the meaning and function of the *kappōret*.

USAGE OF THE VULGATE.

We have seen how the Septuagint modified the usage of the *hilaskomai* words to fit them for the religious teaching of the Old Testament. The same can be said, in general, of the use which the Vulgate made of the words derived from 'propitius'. Ordinarily 'propitior' is used with a middle meaning, the equivalent of 'propitius sum'. We find it followed by a person in the dative, with the meaning 'have mercy on'.[27] Often too it is followed by a dative which refers to a sin or fault; here it has the meaning 'forgive'.[28] Only once is it found used

---

[26]Zac. 7:2; 8:22; Mal. 1:9.

[27]Gen. 32:20; Ex. 30:16; Lev. 23:28; 2 Kings 24:25; 3 Kings 8:50.

[28]2 Par. 6:25; Ps. 24:11; 64:4; 102:3; Jer. 18:23; 31:34.

strictly in the passive, de propitiato peccato',[29] and here there is obviously no question of 'propitiating' God.[30]

Thus, when the Vulgate uses the term 'propitiatorum' to translate the Hebrew *kappōret,* we have no reason for revising the meaning we have already established for the Hebrew term and its Greek equivalent *hilastērion.* 'Propitiatorium' must mean a place where God remits sins, or an instrument through which God exercises mercy. Similarly, when the Vulgate translates the *hilastērion* of Rom. 3:25 by 'propitiatio', we are by no means justified in seeing here a 'propitiation' of God in the normal English sense of the word.

Actually, the Vulgate uses considerable freedom in rendering the Hebrew *kipper.* In the important text of Lev. 16:1-34, we find great variety: 'orare', 'fundere preces', 'rogare', these generally followed by the preposition 'pro'; also 'emundare', 'expiare', followed by the accusative. Elsewhere we find 'propitiari',[31] 'delere',[32] and, it must be admitted, 'placare'.[33] In the last example, however, it is not used with any direct object, and seems to be just an elegant variation of the 'deprecari' used with exactly the same meaning in the sentence before. In the two cases already mentioned,[34] where *kipper* has the meaning 'appease', the Vulgate uses the verb 'placare'. But these examples have no bearing on *religious* usage either of the Hebrew or of the Vulgate.

SUMMING UP.

It should be clear, then, that, despite accidental differences, the Hebrew *kipper,* the Greek *hilaskomai* and the Vulgate 'propitiari' are at one in expressing as a fundamental function of the sacrificial rite, not the appeasement of an angry God, but the remission of sins, the purification of man. God is not regarded as *passive,* but as intensely *active,* making good by the initiative of His mercy the ruin wrought by human sin. The application of these conclusions to the understanding of the religion of the New Testament, especially the redeeming sacrifice of Christ, may be attempted in a future essay.

W. J. DALTON, S.J.

---

[29]Eccl. 5:5.

[30]In English we have taken over the profane meaning of 'propitiatio' rather than that of the Vulgate. Our 'propitiate' is a transitive verb, and its object is necessarily a person. Hence the need for care in the use of this verb in translating from the Bible. Our 'propitiation' (activity by which we placate God) is no accurate translation of the Vulgate 'propitiatio' (quality or activity of God by which He shows Himself merciful and remits sins).

[31]Ex. 30:16, etc.

[32]Dan. 9:22.

[33]Ex. 30:10.

[34]Gen. 32:21; Prov. 16:14.

Book Reviews

NEW LIGHT ON THE PASSION, by Rev. P. O'Connell. M. H. Gill & Son. 76 pp. Price 7/6.

This little book examines the revelations made to four persons about the physical sufferings of Christ and compares the results with the evidence of the well-known Holy Shroud of Turin. The four mystics concerned are St. Bridget of Sweden, Maria d'Agrada, Anne Catherine Emmerich and Teresa Neumann. More detailed works can be easily found on these persons and on the Shroud, but Fr. O'Connell's purpose is to show the remarkable agreement between the visions experienced by these four and the evidence of the Shroud concerning details of Our Lord's passion.

Such a work has the misfortune to cut directly across several controversial questions of which, due to its brevity, it cannot treat adequately, with the result that its conclusions can scarcely be satisfying. Need the mystic's vision of the passion necessarily correspond to historical fact or may it be influenced by the mystic's concept of the passion? Is the authenticity of the Shroud so conclusively proved that Scripture scholars may be blamed for not considering it? And what of Teresa Neumann? Even though one may be inclined to follow Fr. O'Connell's views on one or all of these points there remains in reading this book an uncomfortable feeling that the evidence to the contrary has been somewhat summarily dismissed. Possibly it would have been wiser simply to overlook controversial questions in such a brief study.

On the other hand many unacquainted with the history, study and evidence of the Shroud will find here all the essential information gathered together in brief form without any unnecessary detail and exposed in a very attractive manner. Several excellent photos of the Shroud enhance the value of the book.

B.H.

* * * *

BEING AND BECOMING: An Essay towards a Critical Metaphysic, by D. J. B. Hawkins. Sheed and Ward, London, 1954. Pp. 176. English price, 10/6.

The latest and most interesting of Fr. Hawkin's philosophical essays possesses all that freshness and simplicity of thought and expression that give his books their distinctive value. Competent and scholarly though he is, Fr. Hawkins is not a professor, but a genial and active parish priest, a practical man for whom speculation is not a job but a joy.

Fr. Hawkins reminds us that general metaphysics received systematic treatment as a distinct part of philosophy only in the seventeenth

century, and that most treatises on this subject bear the mark of the excessive abstraction and rationalism which was the common fault of the philosophers of that age. After an introductory chapter on Kant and Hume, Fr. Hawkins singles out the main problems that arise in connection with the term *Being*. He has little difficulty in showing that, since the term *Being* applies principally to existing things, and existing things are all individual, the principal problems are to determine the nature of existence and of individuality. He gives an excellent account of the nature of existence, discarding the view that existence is to be conceived as a perfection added to an essence, and stressing the point that essence is a principle of limitation, or, more plainly, that to be a particular kind of thing is to *be* in a restricted way. But there is clearly a great difficulty here, and Fr. Hawkins has an original solution for it. The principle invoked must have a positive character; a mere negation explains nothing. Fr. Hawkins relates this difficulty to the problem of individuality. The individual existent is not merely a particular instance of a species, it is *this* individual, much more than a bundle of qualities that might, in the abstract, be possessed by many individuals. It is essentially individual. The essence, according to the author, is not merely a principle of limitation, it is also a positive principle of individuality.

Fr. Hawkins then takes the further step of maintaining that what we are primarily aware of is the individual, rejecting the Thomist doctrine that what the mind knows first is the universal. The universal idea is not produced by an unconscious process of abstraction, but by conscious attention to similarities. The pages in which he states and defends this doctrine merit the closest attention.

This is only one sample of the original, though sober, doctrines to be found in this book. Undoubtedly, many of them are insufficiently substantiated, but few writers could have said so much so well as Fr. Hawkins has done within the narrow limits he has imposed on himself.

J.B.

* * * *

THE MEANING OF LOVE, by Robert O. Johann, S.J. Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, 1955. Pp. xii, 133.

Fr. Johann's dissertation is one more proof, if proof there need be, that a good doctoral thesis rarely makes a good book. The laboured academic style, the undiscriminating accumulation of notes, serve to cover up a few original suggestions, which could have been discussed quite comfortably in twenty pages.

Fr. Johann claims that St. Thomas's treatment of love is distorted by ways of speaking derived from Aristotle. While the Angelic Doctor recognises the difference between desire and love in the strict sense, he fails to give due weight to the fact that love is directed towards the personal being of the loved one, whereas desire is principally concerned with some particular quality of the object desired. According

to Fr. Johann, "The charm with which he (the person loved) envelopes me comes from the sole fact that *he exists.*" (p. 45; italics in text.) Such a doctrine can be maintained only by twisting the sense of the word "exist", interpreting St. Thomas's terminology according to the existentialist usage, where it refers to the active exercise of personal liberty. It is the fashion in certain circles to regard this sort of thing as profund!

In spite of its many faults, this book will interest many, because there are so few worthwhile attempts to deal with the problem of the nature of love in Thomistic literature.

J.B.

* * * *

JESUS IN HIS TIME, by Daniel-Rops, of the Acadêmie Francaise. London, 1955. 492 pp. 30/- (Eng.). Eyre and Spottiswoode and Burns Oates.

The election last year of Monsieur Daniel-Rops (to call him by his pen-name) to the Acadêmie Francaise was well merited on literary ability. He is, indeed, not in the first flight as an artist, yet his fervid zeal in putting the results of science at the disposal of the many has won the august body's approval and thus Daniel-Rops has become an Immortal.

His present book was published in French in 1945. Its sale set records for the post-war French literary scene. It might seem to be a useless ploughing of a field which Fouard, Camus, Lagrange, Grandmaison, Lebreton, Prat (so magnificently), Mauriac (if you like to read a wonderfully gifted novelist's conception of Our Lord's life), and Ricciotti (to quote the names of some of Daniel-Rops' predecessors) have worked over, for Daniel-Rops to attempt a new study of our Lord's life. Daniel-Rops, however, unlike the others (excepting Mauriac) is a layman, writing with his eyes on the hungry sheep, seeking truth in Gide, and finding beauty (as Mauriac puts it quaintly) in the classic features of Greta Garbo!

Grandmaison and Prat are for the theologian and the scripture scholar; Daniel-Rops writes for the man in the street. However, he does not make the bad mistake of treating the man in the street as an ignoramus, nor does he treat him as somebody of small importance. The men in the street are multitude, while the theologians and scripture scholars are but a precious handful. Daniel-Rops has studied and read widely in French literature bearing on the New Testament; he has a fine talent for reducing complex arguments to a most understandable form.

He may well have written the book that study circles in Catholic Action have been looking for so long. Only time will show whether this is true or not, but it is to be hoped that chaplains of such study circles will give some consideration to this book when buying books for their clubs out of their meagre funds.

Jesus in His Time has appeared in fifteen languages up to this, and in English, it has been widely welcomed in America, even by such organs as the *New York Times* and the *St. Louis Globe Democrat.* Perhaps the reason is the plan of his work. He opens thus:

There was once a man who lived during a precisely defined period in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius Caesar. His existence is an incontestable fact...yet he said the most surprising things that have ever been heard. He said that he was the Messiah...More astounding still he said he was the Son of God. And he was believed...The mystery of Jesus is nothing more and nothing less than the Mystery of the Incarnation.

Thus Daniel-Rops begins his noble work, in which he combines erudition with a wide use of world literature, the Renans, the Gides, the Prousts, the Dostoieviskis.

Many priests will enjoy reading this fine life of Our Lord with its modern, alert approach, especially as it will exercise their critical approach gained from deeper sources.

The translation, unlike that of Daniel-Rops' earlier book *Israel and the Ancient World,* is very well done. Beyond some obvious misprints, the translator has done Daniel-Rops' French original poor service by speaking of Herod the Great as "the tetrarch Herod" (p. 108). Once again in a very Catholic book, the translator has used for Scriptural quotations the Authorised Version. One would have thought the Knox translation would have been very acceptable to all.

All who love Christ will welcome this attempt to bring Christ and his great message to men of the age of the atom, jet aircraft, heirs to the science of the ages. Yet the Palestinian carpenter of two thousand years ago with his astounding claims cannot be thrust aside. As always the question is: Quid vobis videtur de Christo? Daniel-Rops, to the best of his ability, has given a Catholic answer to that great question. All who love the things of the spirit will feel great pleasure that this devoted son of the Church and of learning has been elected a member of the Forty.

T.V.

* * * *

CORPUS CHRISTI, by E. L. Mascall. Longman's, Green & Co., London. 1953. 185 pp. 18/9 (Aust.).

This volume brings together nine essays on the Church and the Blessed Eucharist by a well-known Anglo-Catholic theologian. The title has a double implication for there is studied not only the Eucharist, sacrifice and sacrament, but this great gift of God is viewed in its relation to the Church as Christ's Mystical Body. The very first essay is a study of the inner spiritual unity which Jesus promised and gave to His Church, and thenceforward the thought of this unity is ever present. The Sacraments are considered in general and exist, the author concludes, "to make and preserve and extend the Body of Christ, the holy people of God." (p. 45). There is a long study of the sacrifice of the

Mystical Body, the mass, with particular reference to the work of De la Taille, Vonier and Masure. The notion that sacrifice implies death is rejected, as a medieval invention, and all 'immolation' theories spurned in favour of a re-presentative causality of the sacrament. This demands that the sacraments involve a new order of creation and are causes in a completely new way. It is introduced in other contexts, particularly with regard to the Real Presence where we are told Christ is present "simply because, by his institution and promise, the bread and wine have become the effectual signs...of his Body and Blood". (p. 122). However, this is not developed further. He quotes Masure chiding post-reformation theologians for weakening the meaning of 'sign', but surely it is up to those who speak of this unique causality of signs to show clearly what it is. The essay on the mass does not do this, nor is it attempted elsewhere in the book, and a fine development of an approach to the Eucharist is weakened accordingly.

There are besides studies of the eucharistic doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas and Bishop Gore, an essay on the development of the eucharistic liturgy and two short comments on private masses and personal devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. This last subject emphasises a dangerous trend which is noticeable throughout the whole work. The author is so entranced by the beauty of the doctrine of the Mystical Body that he tends to neglect the individual nature of souls. There are two sides to the coin. The growth of the Mystical Body is by the sanctification of the individual and this requires the individual's personal act. If this is not given enough emphasis, the treatment becomes unbalanced and misleading.

For the theologian this is an interesting book, as the author has considerable insight and wide knowledge of catholic and anglican authorities. It is not for the ordinary catholic. The matter is too technical and, often, seriously against the faith. It must be recorded that papal supremacy is expressly denied, the Council of Trent belittled and the lack of these guides shown in uncertainty concerning the words of consecration and uneasiness in defending private masses and personal devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. But there are reasons given for each attitude and this makes for stimulating reading.

B.J.

* * * *

LOVE AND VIOLENCE. Sheed & Ward, London. Pages 260. Price 18/- (English).

This is symposium based on the 1946 volume of the *Etudes Carmelitaines*, so it is not surprising that it cannot easily be summarised or appraised. The writers are men of ability, the subject concerns two phenomena which are found on all levels of life and so can be examined from many view-points. Too much richness is the problem. The way to get a real idea of what this book contains is to read it.

Certainly no-one will read it without gain. It considers love and aggressiveness from man's side and from God's. It examines their

obscure physchological basis and their expression in works of genius. They are seen against the background of war and of art. The valuable work of placing general ireas in concrete surroundings, of showing what the abstract idea we have of love or hate looks like in the real world of individuals, is done thoroughly and, in the main, pleasantly.

The subjects treated may be grouped under the four heads of—Art, Psychology, Scripture and Theology, though this leaves homeless an article of Gustave Thibon on the perfect christian attitude to war. Under Art come a general essay, and particular studies of Michelangelo, Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, and Dostoievsky. These can be read with profit even by those with little previous knowledge of the subjects, though it is asking too much to give large quotations from Michelangelo's verse without providing a translation. Incidently, there are eight black and white plates throughout the volume, all reproductions of paintings and drawings mentioned in these articles.

Psychology provides three studies dealing with the roots of love and violence in instinct, the problem raised by their close association in human personality, and their place in the soul's relations with God as illustrated by the works of St. John of the Cross. The second of these, *The Problem of Ambivalence*, by Georges Parcheminey, is especially interesting for it explains the psychological foundations of love and hate in terms of Freud. Once it is admitted that "impulses never explain any psychic phenomena or any of the humblest or most elevated feelings in art or religion, but constitute their motivation form, their energy . ." (p. 96), the author accepts the theories of Freud as a sound psychology.

What has been said gives some idea of the book's value, yet no mention has been made of the searchings into the gospels, the character of St. Paul, the Apocalypse or God as revealed in the Old Testament which make up the Scripture section, nor does it include the solitary theological article, which is probably the best thing in the book. This last is entitled God of Wrath or God of Love? and is by Père Philippe de la Trinité, O.C.D. In eighty pages it studies God's love in the creation, fall and redemption of man. It provides a peak in value, interest and readability, but only carries higher qualities to be found throughout this volume.

B.J.

* * * *

SAINT THERESE OF LISIEUX, The Making of a Saint, by J. B. Morton, 112 pp. Burns Oates, 1954. 9/6 (Eng.).

Judging from the number of books published on St. Thérèse, someone must always be writing about her in one of the four corners of the world. Articulate people in all walks of life seem suddenly to feel their spirit tremble to awareness because they have met her spirit, and cannot rest until they set down the experience in words for all to read. Yesterday, a German theologian; to-day, an English journalist, the humorous "Beachcomber" who is read at so many British breakfast-tables. If that audience should ever get to know that he has written

a life of St. Thérèse; and, further, if they should read it, what will they make of that facet of the "Beachcomber"? Let it be said at once that he brings to his study of the saint all his good qualities as a writer —among which are his good sense and his humility.

In his prefatory paragraph he allows a glimpse of his own spirit, as in the words: "If it be asked what can possibly remain to be said about her by one who is not a theologian, nor entitled to claim any credentials for such a task as this, I can only reply that the disclosure of her impact on an ordinary Catholic layman may not, I hope, be without value. The writing of this book was not lightly undertaken. It was completed in a growing conviction that the teaching of St. Thérèse, which is for all time, has a special significance for our tortured age . . . "

This book is not a biography, though it mentions the salient years and crises in the development of the saint. What is interesting in it is the clear light which the author catches from her radiance to make it shine on the dark places of our bewildered civilisation. He will select some such oft-repeated twaddle as the following: "If religion is to become again a vital force, its teaching must be re-stated to suit the needs of the modern world." He will then criticise it, and show how the confusion is only resolved in the acceptance of the teaching of the Gospels—the strong corner-stone of the system (if one may call it so) of St. Thérèse.

He quotes a French writer who went to Lisieux as a sceptic: "It is not necessary to be a believer to realise that you are in the presence of one who has attained to the very summit of moral perfection . . . There are souls so purposeful that they literally create what they desire. We cannot come near them without being carried along by the force of their wings."

J. B. Morton has done a good work in giving us his fresh assessment of the heroic idealism of a saint the import of whose message is perennial.

M.O.

* * * *

ANCIENT CHRISTIAN WRITERS. Vol XVIII. St. Gregory of Nyssa. *The Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes.* Translated and annotated by Hilda C. Graef. Longmans, Green and Co. 1954.

For those who love the beautiful and amiable blend of humanism and sanctity, which has appeared in all ages in the Church, the great Cappadocians of the fourth century offer a special attraction. Unfortunately, they are too little known, and of the great "Three-star constellation" of Cappadocia, Gregory of Nyssa is perhaps the least known. Basil, the Roman of the Greek Church, has received the title of Great; Gregory Nazianzen was the Hellenic mouth of orthodoxy; but St. Basil's younger brother, Gregory of Nyssa, was rather a failure as a bishop and (it seems) owing to a slight tincture of Origenism in the question of the universal Apocatastasis, missed being venerated

as a Doctor of the Universal Church. Though registered in the Roman Maryrology as a Saint, who was "vita et eruditione clarissimus", he is not honoured with a feast in the Latin Church.

His works, however, have been receiving considerable attention from western theologians during the last hundred years, and it is the considered opinion of no less competent an authority on the writings of the Bishop of Nyssa than Father Daniélou, that Gregory is second to none as a philosopher, a theologian and a mystic.

Miss Graef's bigraphical introduction, having chiefly in view the two minor works which she translates, is not very comprehensive. It gives, however, an informative and pleasing picture of the lovable Cappadocian and of some aspects of his thought. The translation of five sermons on the Pater noster and of eight on the eight Beatitudes (which seems to be translation almost at its very best), forms the chief part of the book. The philosophic basis of Gregory's thinking in these sermons is undoubtedly Platonic, but it is dyed through and through with the higher knowledge he derived from the Holy Scriptures. His illustrations, taken especially from physiology and medicine, are very striking, and the exuberance of his language betrays the quondam rhetor. We would draw special attention to the sermon on the beatitude of "the pure of heart". It is particularly characteristic of Gregory.

The notes show the learning that we should expect from the senior Assistant of the editor of the Oxford Lexicon of Patristic Greek. She seems, however, to have nodded in note 114 on the Beatitudes. What evidence is there to support an outright denial that St. Peter was crucified "head downwards"? Eusebius and 4th century Fathers believed it.

One regrets, of course, the absence of the Greek text, but, as a translation, this volume is perfect.

W.L.

* * * *

DOUBT IN CANON LAW, by Roger Viau, S.T.L., J.C.L. pp. viii, 117.

THE CESSATION OF DELEGATED POWER, by Max George DeWitt, A.B., J.C.L. pp. ix, 144. Both from the Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C. 1954. Each 2 dollars.

These two doctoral dissertations were presented to the Catholic University of America in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the doctorate in Canon Law. The set-up is very satisfactory. There is a clear historical and doctrinal presentation. Each citation has its reference, and there are Bibliographies and Indices, both Biographical and Alphabetical.

Fr. Viau first considers Doubt in the Corpus Juris, in Suarez and in St. Alphonsus. His investigation of the value of *Dubium Juris* in the Corpus leads him to the conclusion that there is here a canonical progression from earlier tutorism to a later more liberal position, expressed in the phrase: "Lex dubia non ligat". Of Suarez he says

that his treatment of *Dubium Juris* was the "first logical and articulate treatment", and his position "became the one that was later to be adopted in the Code of Canon Law" (p. 40). It is interesting to find his conclusion regarding St. Alphonsus: "An uncertain or doubtful obligation was not an obligation at all" (p. 48). Not all would agree with this reading of St. Alphonsus' mind. After the historical introduction there follows a commentary of 50 pages on c. 15: "Leges . . . in dubio juris non urgent". In particular his Article 3 "Specific Applications" is of practical interest.

Fr. DeWitt introduces his study with a brief account of Jurisdiction. and Delegation. In the second part of his dissertation he takes up the causes of cessation as given in c. 207. The opinions of commentators, ancient and modern are given copiously; thus one can readily obtain the present state of canonical opinion on each point. Being human, we rejoice to find his elaboration of c. 207/2: "Sed potestate pro foro interno concessa, actus per inadvertentiam positus, elapso tempore vel exhausto numero casuum, validus est". (pp. 50 ff.)

The Canon Law Faculty of the Catholic University of America is to be congratulated on the skill with which the labours of its students have been directed to studies which are not only of doctrinal value to canonists, but are also of practical worth to all engaged in the ministry. Anyone with a taste for canonical study will find interest and profit in these two dissertations.

J.H.

* * * *

CONFLICT AND LIGHT, edited by Père Bruno, O.C.D. (London: Sheed & Ward, 1952. 192 pp.: 10/6, Eng.).

This book is a collection of studies in psychological disturbance and readjustment, written by eminent European priests and physicians. Happy the reader with no more knowledge of the subject than comes from an acquaintance with the surrealist paintings of Chirico and Dali. It is true that a reviewer, poorly equipped, approaches this book with considerable diffidence, only to be dispelled by the reassuring name of Mgr. Charles Journet, the author of the first study. At least we shall understand *him*. And what beautiful pages are his, as he restates the teaching of our redemption. He quotes an interesting passage from André Gide: "The great mistake is to picture the devil as a romantic figure; that is why I took so long to recognize him. He is no more romantic nor classical than the person with whom he is dealing. He is as diverse as man himself; more so, in fact, for he adds to his diversity ....I sought to master evil by compromise, whereas it was precisely through compromise that the Evil One himself took possession of me...."

All the essays in this book are translations from the French journal, *Etudes Carmelitaines*, where they first appeared in a series under the heading, "Collection de Psychologie Religeuse". Here they are set down in two parts: one, Darkness and Sin; two, Balance and

Light. Many of the chapters have been given as lectures in different European Conferences; one would say that those pages are of interest only to priests and physicians dealing with various cases of neurosis. Still, there are several topics useful to teachers and social workers when confronted with theories of psychoanalysis put forward by lay-people as a good substitute for the sacrament of penance.

In this regard, there is a valuable chapter on Sin and the Christian Sense of Guilt. The author examines the attitude of the psychiatrist and the psycho-analyst in whose view "sin is equated with misguided behaviour; and the sense of guilt with its agonizing remorse and its urge to make amends is regarded as an irrational state of mind which must at all costs be eradicated and prevented from recurring". But, as the author points out, "Christian experience, especially that of the saints, proves that emotional recognition of the sinfulness of self in the sight of God, far from leading to paralysing anguish, is transcended by the action of grace, the unfailing source of an incomparable joy, balance and activity".

There is also an excellent paper on "How Children Acquire a False Sense of Guilt". It makes one realise how careful school authorities should be to choose teachers specially well equipped, when it comes to preparing children for their first confession and Communion. The sad little cases given here could only have happened where teachers and parents were ignorant of the elements of child psychology.

Of all the papers in this book the one entitled "Present Norms of Holiness" seems to be alone in its appeal to every thoughtful Catholic. In fact it is a chapter which many readers will ponder over with great advantage to their spiritual life. It is by that master, Father Gabriel, O.D.C., whom many will remember as the author of "The Spiritual Director". He is a Consultor to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and as such knows the mind of the Church on the subject of heroic sanctity. His essay is really a commentary on the utterance of Pope Pius XI on this subject, made on the occasion of the proclamation of the heroism of the virtues of Blessed Benildus of the Christian Schools. Part of the consoling oration of the Pope deals with what he calls the "terrible daily round" that each one of us has to tread if we are to set our faces towards heroism. "What fortitude", he exclaims, "is needed to resist this terrible, crushing, monotonous, suffocating daily round!...." Father Gabriel's commentary on the whole oration is masterly.

M.O.

* * * *

IS THE PRIEST AT HOME? A Play in Three Acts, by Joseph Tomelty. Belfast, H. R. Carter Publications Ltd., 1954. 4/6.

The life of a priest should be good matter for the playwright, because by education and environment, and generally by temperament, it is a rich and effective life. Mr. Tomelty, the well-known Irish actor, presents a priest measuring swords with a north of Ireland parish. The

problem of the priest's supremacy dominates the play, and from a few varied and sharp characters there emerges an engaging struggle.

The play is unusual. For the intellect there is constantly an absorbing problem, and the author works up for us, long with the humour and goodness, the narrowness and smugness that may accompany a strong Catholic tradition. Here Mr. Tomelty shows himself more akin to the dryness of Sean O'Faolain than the romanticism of Canon Sheehan in his presentation of Irish life. The truth of his picture is best left to Irish critics, but as it is presented it is certainly convincing. Artistically, the play seems to divide rather sharply and strangely into half comedy and half drama, and although each part is handled well, the drama holds us enough to prevent a first-rate comedy, and the humour is distracting enough to prevent an intense drama. Of the two, the humour fares better, thanks mainly to one Jimmy, "the janitor", and to Mrs. Perpetua O'Kane herself: the former is a delightful Sam Weller-cum-Jeeves and is half the play, while Mrs. O'Kane, head of everything except the football team, is horrifyingly real. The centre of the play, Fr. Malan, is not up to the same standard, indeed he shows a naivety and heavy-footedness that would hardly do justice to the rawest young curate. As a picture of frustrated idealism, however, he holds his own. Technically, the main fault of the play is weakness of dialogue, especially in pointless lines (e.g., when told the sick are all "mountain cases", the priest asks, "In the mountains you mean?" Scarcely a scintillating question, and this sort of thing is annoying when continued.) The habit of bringing one character on stage as another leaves becomes something of a ritual. But, these apart, the play is well put together, and would be easy to produce, having only one set and no complications.

This play is certainly entertaining reading for priests, and if a group were looking for something to present to an audience slightly above average in capacity, this would be good entertainment. Even from a purely educational aspect it should be an eye-opener to most Catholics.

R.W.